00028404

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 July, 2018

SOCIALISM IN ENGLAND

28404

BY

SIDNEY WEBB, LL.B.

WITH AN INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

SECOND EDITION

LONDON
SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO.
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1893

00028404

SOCIALISM IN ENGLAND.

PREFACE.

THE following account of the development of Socialism, in this country, was originally prepared at the request of the President and Council of the American Economic Association, and published in their series of monographs.[1] As it was found of interest to English readers, it has been thoroughly revised and brought up to date for publication here. Full references are given to Socialist publications, with a view to facilitating further study of a movement, the complete significance of which is not yet adequately realised by English politicians.

SIDNEY WEBB.

4 PARK VILLAGE EAST, LONDON, N.W.
December, 1889.

[1] Vol. iv., No. 2, May, 1889 (Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore).

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EDITION..... ix

1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIALIST IDEAL.

The Utopias—The Influence of the Evolution Hypothesis — The Methods of Revolution — Modern Socialism—Definitions..... 1

2. THE RISE OF THE ENGLISH SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

The Forerunners—"Progress and Poverty"—The Revolt of the Radicals—The Democratic Federation —Socialist Radicalism..... 13

3. THE ENGLISH SOCIALIST ORGANIZATIONS.

General Character—The Social Democratic Federation —The Socialist League—The Fabian Society—The Christian Socialist Society—Socialism at Bristol and Sheffield—The Tyneside District—The "Labour Party"—The "Anarchist" Section—The Land Nationalization Movement—Scotland and Ireland... 28

4. SOCIALISM IN THE CHURCHES.

The Religious Side of the Movement—The Guild of St. Matthew—Socialism and the Bishops—Christianity and Democracy..... 63

5. SOCIALISM AT THE UNIVERSITIES.

The Leaven at Oxford and Cambridge—Toynbee Hall —Socialist Publications—Character of the University Influence—Abandonment of Individualism—Mr. Herbert Spencer..... 74

6. SOCIALISM IN POLITICAL ECONOMY. PAGE

The Change of Tone—The Influence of Evolution—Convergence towards Socialism—English Socialism and Karl Marx—Recent Economic Literature—The Failure of Co-operation—Its Economic Inadequacy.—Economic Socialism..... 81

7. PARLIAMENTARY AND MUNICIPAL SOCIALISM.

The Zenith of Individualism—Factory Acts—Sanitary Restrictions—Municipal Administration of Capital—Limitation of the Hours of Labour—Public Education and Childfeeding—The Housing of the Poor—Municipalization versus Nationalization—The Socialising of England—The Work of the "Practical Man."..... 98

8. SOCIALISM IN POLITICS.

The Tendency to New Legislation—The Fluidity of the English Constitution—The Conservative Party—The Liberal Party—The Radical Section—The Programme of Socialist Radicalism—The Political Momentum—Convergence of the Tendencies..... 118

INDEX..... 134

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE following description of the recent development of Socialism in this country was originally prepared at the beginning of 1889, at the request of the American Economic Association, and published in their series of monographs.[1] It was revised for publication in the Social Science Series in December, 1889.

The call for a second edition compels the author to consider in what way the work can be made more serviceable to its future readers. The four years that have passed since its first publication have witnessed a great growth of Socialist opinion among us, and much that appeared in

[1] Vol. IV., No. 2, May, 1889.

1889, unduly enthusiastic and rashly prophetic, will now be accepted as a moderate estimate. It seems, however, on the whole, best to allow the account of 1889 to stand as it was written: to leave the picture of that year unblurred by any attempt at revision; and to supplement some of its defects in this prefatory chapter.

Perhaps the most useful feature of the account was its exact references to the minor Socialist literature of the period, so difficult of access to those outside the movement. The author's obvious shortcomings in this respect can now be made good by consulting the Fabian Society's bibliographical tract, "What to Read,"[1] which contains a well-selected list of all the best publications connected with Socialism, and, indeed, with all branches of Sociology.

The other useful feature of the book was,

[1] Second edition, 1893; to be obtained from the Secretary of the Fabian Society, 276 Strand, London; price, 3d.

perhaps, its account of the different Socialist organisations. These remain, with one or two exceptions, much as they were. The elements of disintegration in the Socialist League, which were noticeable in 1889, have since brought about its dissolution. The "Commonweal," after various vicissitudes, has, I believe, finally ceased to appear. But the somewhat idealistic features of the League's propaganda are continued by Mr. William Morris and his friends under the style of the Hammersmith Socialist Society, whose useful educational meetings are held every Sunday evening at Kelmscott House, Hammersmith.

The other organisations continue their educational work on much the same lines as those described in 1889. The Social Democratic Federation retains its old activity, but does not appear to me to have grown, either mentally or in numerical strength, with the movement which its leaders did so much to initiate. The development of an independent "Labour

Party" among the artisans of the midland and northern towns has tended somewhat to limit the expansion of the most rigidly *doctrinaire* of English Socialist organisations. But "Justice" is still published weekly at the Federation office, at 337 Strand, London, and the reader will have no difficulty in forming a judgment as to the part which is played by its editors and contributors.

The Fabian Society, which now possesses central offices at 276 Strand, London, maintains its continuity of doctrine and policy, but has undergone the transformation from an exclusively Metropolitan influence, to a network of between seventy or eighty local societies scattered through all the industrial centres, led, but in no way controlled, by the original London Society, which now issues a monthly business circular known to the initiated as "Fabian News." A full account of this development will be found in the annual reports, which are issued in April of each year, and in Mr. Bernard Shaw's audacious and amusing address to the

Conference of Fabian Societies in February, 1892.[1]

Outside the explicitly Socialist societies, the most remarkable development has occurred in the English Land Restoration League, whose "Red Vans" have perambulated the rural districts with considerable educational results.[2] The Christian Social Union, too, which was just starting in 1889, has become a body of widespread influence among the clergy, and its various reports and other publications should not be overlooked by the student.[3]

But, as was observed and predicted in 1889, by far the most important advance in Socialist opinion and Socialist work has taken place out-

[1] "The Fabian Society: what it has done, and how it has done it." (Fabian Society, 276 Strand; price, 1d.)

[2] See the admirable special reports of these "Red Van" campaigns, issued (at 9 Duke Street, Adelphi, London) in January, 1892 and 1893; price, 1d. each.

[3] To be obtained from the Secretary. See also the *Economic Review.* (London: Percival & Co. Quarterly, 3s.)

side the professedly Socialist organisations. The three great strides since 1889 have been the triumphant progress in Collectivism of the London County Council, the conversion of the "old" Trade Unions, and the development of a thoroughly Collectivist "Labour Party."

The triumphant victory of the "Progressive" Party in the London County Council, at the election in March, 1892, was the more striking in that the contest was avowedly fought upon the issue of Municipal Socialism. The large majorities, by which John Burns and other declared Socialists were returned, were not more significant of the change of tone in London politics than the way in which the Liberal Party, as far as the Metropolis is concerned, has been driven to adopt and actively to support the whole municipal programme put forward by the Socialist organisations.[1] This

[1] Compare the Fabian Tract, No. 8, "Facts for Londoners," issued in 1888, and the County Council Programme of the London Liberal and Radical Union, February, 1892.

has resulted in a marked intellectual clearage between London Radicalism, of pronounced "Collectivist" sympathies, and the old "Manchester School" Liberalism, which still passes current in the provincial towns.[1] It seems probable that this clearage will become even more strongly marked as the issues develop, and that the surviving capitalist Liberals of the old type will gradually fall away from the Liberal Party. Eventually, it may be that the party, rent asunder by conflicting principles of social administration, will have to be reconstituted, as I believe, mainly as a working-class organisation upon a practically Collectivist basis.

The work of the first three years of the County Council is described in "The History of the London County Council," by William Saunders, M.P., L.C.C. (London: Steele & Jones, 1892.) A complete survey of London questions will be found in "The London Programme," by the present writer. (London: Sonnenschein, 1891.)

[1] See the article on "The Moral of the General Election" in the *Contemporary Review* for August, 1892.

This development cannot fail to be strongly influenced by the remarkable conversion to Collectivism of the Trade Union world. Four years ago a fierce conflict was raging between the so-called "new" and "old" Unionists. This conflict, which was largely personal in its nature, has now practically subsided. The Lancashire cotton-spinners, lately the most formidable opponents of the Eight Hours Bill, are now actively pressing for its enactment. The Trade Union Congress of 1892 scarcely included ten per cent. of delegates opposed to this measure; and although sectional interests still divide the Trade Union forces, it has become apparent that (outside of Northumberland) there are but few adherents of Individualism in their ranks.

A somewhat similar change of feeling is to be discerned in the able leaders of the great Co-operative Movement. The two schools into which the Co-operative world is divided—the advocates of Associations of Producers and

those who put their faith rather in Associations of Consumers—correspond, indeed, to some extent, to the Individualists and the Collectivists in the larger worlds of political philosophy and public life. This distinction, and all that it imports, is now becoming more clearly recognised.[1] Hitherto the advocates of what is called "Co-operative Production," the spiritual descendants of the "Christian Socialists" of 1848, have posed and been accepted as the idealists of the Co-operative Movement. The thousands of sturdy working-men who have built up the magnificent Store system in the North of England, are, however, coming to realise that they are working towards an ideal of social organisation as much higher and sounder than that of the "self-governing workshop" as it is opposed to this. But this wider ideal—the substitution for the profitmaker of the collective organisation of the whole body of

[1] See "The Co-operative Movement in Great Britain," by Beatrice Potter (Mrs. Sidney Webb).

consumers—is essentially Collectivist in character, whereas the control of industry by selected little groups of profitmakers is but a variant of the existing industrial Individualism. It is the recognition of this fundamental distinction which is widening the gulf between the tiny Associations of Producers and the large and rapidly-growing federations of Associations of Consumers which make up nineteen-twentieths of the Co-operative Movement of to-day.

It was to the other twentieth—the Individualist advocates of the "self-governing workshop"—that the somewhat disparaging comments in a later chapter were addressed. In no direction is the progress of the "new spirit" in thought more marked than in the Democratic side of the Co-operative Movement with its close analogy to the municipal association of citizens for the supply of their common needs.

Scarcely less significant than the change of opinion among the Trade Unionists and Co-

operators, has been the rapid progress towards the formation of an organised "Independent Labour Party." The successful Conference held at Bradford in February, 1893, and still more, the large votes polled by various independent labour candidates in 1892 and 1893, even when opposed by Liberals and Conservatives, testify to the extent to which the Liberal Party has lost the confidence of considerable sections of the working-class world. Whether the Independent Labour Party is destined to become one of the leading political forces in the State must still be reckoned as uncertain. The great national Trade Unions still stand aloof from its ranks, and are at this moment hesitating whether they shall not themselves take a hand in the Parliamentary game. On the other hand the Radical wing of the Liberal Party is becoming more and more identified with "Labour" objects, and with the Englishman's rooted habits of party adherence, it is still possible that the Liberal Party of to-day,

purged of its Whig and capitalist elements, may itself become the Labour Party of the future. What is of significance to the present purpose is that the Independent Labour Party is almost unanimously "Collectivist" in opinion, and that the Bradford Conference, whilst deciding to retain the designation of Labour rather than Socialist, adopted with practical unanimity, an avowedly extreme Socialist programme.

All this does not, it is scarcely necessary to say, indicate the approach of anything in the nature of a "revolution," or make it likely that barricades will be erected in the streets of London. Progress even in particular reforms may still be exceedingly slow. Ground rents still sell for twenty-five years' purchase, and those who profit by long-threatened abuses, like the members of the unreformed City Companies, scarcely yet shake in their shoes. But what is fairly clear, to nearly all students of political life in England, is that the lines of battle are being

shifted. The issue cannot long remain between one capitalist party and another. The political conflicts of the near future will necessarily take place between the party representing property and economic privilege on the one hand, and the party of the wage-earners on the other. The fundamental principle of the one will be Individualism; that of the other will be Collectivism. To the former must naturally belong not only the great mass of the propertied class, capitalists as well as landlords, but also all those who fear that, in the aim at greater social comfort, there is danger of impairing the free play of mind and individual initiative upon which social progress ultimately depends. On the other side will be found those who see in well-organised social arrangements the only chance of securing that very individual development and free initiative to more than a small fraction of the community. It is this shifting of the issue in thought that supplies the key-note to the following imperfect sketch of one

side of the development. The corresponding shifting of the lines of battle, already to some extent accomplished as far as London politics are concerned, will be the dominant feature of English political life during the remainder of the century.

SIDNEY WEBB.

10 NETHERHALL GARDENS, LONDON, N.W.
March, 1893.

SOCIALISM IN ENGLAND.

CHAPTER I.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIALIST IDEAL.

"We are all Socialists now," lately avowed Sir William Harcourt in the House of Commons, and the Prince of Wales recently made the same confession. Whatever may be the value of these vague declarations, it is certain that the progress of Socialism is just now the most marked characteristic of English thought.[1]

At the same time, the influence of Socialism in our public life may very easily be overlooked by a casual observer, especially as it is still often ignored or misapprehended by public men themselves. English politics are, by tradition,

[1] See the pamphlet by the present writer, *English Progress towards Social Democracy*. (Fabian Society, 276 Strand, London.)

so exclusively an affair of the "classes" that even the greatest movements in democratic thought are apt to escape the notice of those unaccustomed to watch the tendencies of the still largely inarticulate masses. The development of Socialistic institutions has, moreover, been so gradual, and has met with such universal acceptance, that the great majority of citizens are still quite unaware of the extent to which Individualist principles have been abandoned. The ordinary party politician, intent only upon the issues of the moment, will often deny that Socialism, as a vital political force, has any existence in England at all.

Few persons indeed, adequately realize the rapid progress of Democracy in England, whether political or social. We are getting beyond the time of Reform Bills. The changes now occurring are much less in the machinery of government than in the spirit by which that machinery is worked. Those unfamiliar with English political life are almost inevitably led to mistake the surviving forms of Feudalism, with their corresponding social inequalities, for greater drawbacks and deductions from the political Democracy than they really are. It

may confidently be asserted that the existence of an hereditary peerage offers less of an obstacle to genuine reform than that of the political "rings and bosses," so graphically portrayed by Mr. Bryce.[1] The English Conservative Party, moreover, by no means corresponds to the various conservative or reactionary elements in continental politics, but is itself constantly being "permeated" by new ideas emanating from the other side. A party whose leaders carried the abolition of the Corn Laws (1846), most of the Factory Acts, household suffrage in the towns (1867), and Democratic local self-government in London and the rural districts (1888), cannot be said to be a mere party of reaction. The fact that all these measures were unwilling concessions to popular pressure only emphasizes their democratic character.

Nor is it easy to realize the extent of the progress of the economic side of Democracy—that is to say, Socialism itself. Students have grown so accustomed to think of Socialism as a mere "Utopia," spun from the humanity-intoxicated brains of various Frenchmen of the beginning

[1] *The American Commonwealth, Vol. II.*

of the century, that they find great difficulty in recognizing it in any other aspect. But on the part of the critics this is simple ignorance. Down to the present generation the aspirant after social reform, whether Socialist or Individualist, naturally embodied his ideas in a detailed plan of a new social order, from which all contemporary evils were eliminated. Just as Plato had his "Republic," Campanella his "City of the Sun," and Sir Thomas More his "Utopia," so Babœuf had his "Charter of Equality," Cabet his "Icaria," St. Simon his "Industrial System," and Fourier his ideal "Phalanstery." Robert Owen spent a fortune in pressing upon a stiff-necked generation a "New Moral World;" and even Comte, superior as he was to many of the weaknesses of his time, must needs add a detailed "Polity" to his "Philosophy" of Positivism.

The leading feature of all these proposals (not excluding the last) was what may be called their "statical" character. The ideal society was represented as a perfectly balanced equilibrium without need or possibility of future organic alteration. Now-a-days, owing mainly to the efforts of Comte, Darwin and Spencer,

we can no longer think of the future society as an unchanging state. The social ideal from being statical has become dynamic. The necessity of the constant growth and development of the social organism has become axiomatic. No philosopher now looks for anything but the gradual passing of the old order into the new, without breach of continuity or abrupt general change of social tissue. The new becomes itself old, often before it is consciously recognised as new, and history shows us nothing but constant gradual evolution.

Most Socialists have learnt this lesson[1] even better than their opponents, and find now their strongest argument therein. But the common criticism of Socialism has not yet noted the change, and continues to deal mainly with the obsolete Utopias of the pre-evolutionary age. Modern Socialists are still reproached with the

[1] "I am aware that there are some who suppose that our present bourgeois arrangements must be totally distroyed and others substituted almost at a blow. But, however successful a revolution might be, it is certain that mankind cannot change its whole nature all at once. Break the old shell, certainly, but never forget the fact that the new forms *must* grow out of the old." H. M. Hyndman, *Historical Basis of Socialism*, p. 305 (London, 1883, Kegan Paul & Co.) Lassalle thought the transformation would take 200 years.

domestic details of an imaginary "Phalanstery," or with the failure of "Queenwood" or "Icaria," whereas they are now advocating the conscious adoption of principles of social organization which advanced communities have already dimly and unconsciously found to be the inevitable outcome of Democracy and the Industrial Revolution.

A corresponding change has taken place in the stages by which it is expected that reforms will come. Two generations ago the social prophet, seeing the impossibility of at once converting the whole country, founded here and there small companies of the faithful, who immediately attempted to put in practice the complete ideal as held by their members. The gradual adoption of the ideal by the whole people was expected from the steady expansion of these isolated communities. But this expectation was not fulfilled, and although many of the societies attained, under favourable circumstances, a marked economic success,[1] their success outside of the world was often only less

[1] See Nordhoff's *Communistic Societies in the United States*; Noyes' *History of American Socialism*; and Holyoake's *History of Co-operation*.

fatal to the real progress of Socialism in the world than the complete failure of others.

Prophets, now-a-days, do not found a partial community which adopts the whole faith; they cause rather the partial adoption of their faith by the whole community. Incomplete reform is effected in the world of ordinary citizens, instead of complete reform outside of it. The gradual growth of Socialism is now seen to be by vertical instead of horizontal expansion. The endeavour is now not so much to disintegrate or supersede the existing social organizations, as to expand them. By this method not only is the social "tradition" made use of in the social evolution, but also, though progress may be slow, failure is impossible. No nation having once nationalized or municipalized any industry has ever retraced its steps or reversed its action. No failure of any experiment in such "collectivisation" is anywhere recorded.

Nor is there any special Socialist method of reform. It may suit the interested defenders of the existing order, or heated journalistic imaginations, to imagine that Socialism necessarily implies a sudden and forcible overthrow of police and government in a kind of tumul-

tuous rising of the common people. The student of Socialism knows that it is not necessarily, or even usually, bound up with anything of the sort. It is a safe maxim that the character of a revolutionary movement in this respect depends mainly upon the nature of the repressing forces.

In Russia, for instance, whatever Socialist thought exists, is a portion of the so-called Nihilist movement. This is, itself, not Socialist in character, (either "collectivist" or "anarchist,") but seeks merely political and administrative reforms. The violent methods used by some of the Russian Nihilists are, however, not followed in countries enjoying greater political freedom. In Germany, in spite of considerable repression, Socialism is an exclusively Parliamentary force of the first magnitude. In France it is mainly a factor in Paris municipal politics. In England to-day the comparatively small avowed Socialist army obtains most of its influence by the unconscious permeation of all schools of thought. In all three countries the development of Socialistic institutions is gradual, persistent, and carried out by legislative enactments. Whatever may be the case in other countries, no one acquainted with English

politics can reasonably fear that this feature will not continue. No student of society, whether Socialist or Individualist, can doubt that any important organic changes will necessarily be (1) Democratic, and thus acceptable to a majority of the people and prepared for in the minds of all; (2) gradual, and thus causing no dislocation, however rapid may be the rate of progress; (3) not regarded as immoral by the mass of people, and thus not subjectively demoralising to them; and in this country, at any rate (4), constitutional and peaceful.

If Socialism is thus neither a Utopia nor a specially violent method of revolution, what, it may be asked, are its distinctive features? It is not easy to reply in a single sentence. The ideas denoted by Socialism represent the outcome of a gradual change of thought in economics, ethics and politics. The Socialist is distinguished from the Individualist, not so much by any special Shibboleth as by a complete difference as to the main principles of social organization. The essential contribution of the century to sociology has been the supersession of the Individual by the Community as

the starting point of social investigations.[1] Socialism is the product of this development, arising with it from the contemporary industrial evolution. On the economic side, Socialism implies the collective administration of rent and interest, leaving to the individual only the wages of his labour, of hand or brain. On the political side, it involves the collective control over, and ultimate administration of, all the main instruments of wealth production. On the ethical side, it expresses the real recognition of fraternity, the universal obligation of personal service, and the subordination of individual ends to the common good.

These fundamental ideas of Socialism do not always find explicit expression in the programme of any one exponent. The character of the propaganda, like its practical demands upon the legislature, is necessarily conditioned by the particular circumstances of the locality and the time. Socialism suffers, too, like every other movement, from the imperfections of its

[1] A full statement of this intellectual movement will be found in the articles "Political Economy" and "Socialism" in the Encyclopædia Britannica (ninth edition). See also T. Kirkup's *Enquiry Into Socialism* (London, 1887, Longmans).

advocates and adherents. Springing, as it does from the existence of hideous social wrongs, and the unspeakable misery of tens of thousands of sufferers, we must not be surprised to find it frequently allied with bitterness, hatred and the wild justice of revenge. Long despised and rejected by nearly all the educated class, it is not to be wondered at that Socialism should find expression in forms and proposals often not consistent with science or with themselves. An easy triumph usually awaits those defenders of contemporary institutions who are satisfied with exposing the fallacies of any particular Socialist writer. An easy excuse for standing aloof is afforded to the "philosophic Radical" or other "superior person" by the cruder vagaries of badly organized Socialist bodies or uninstructed Socialist enthusiasts. The more candid student will endeavour to find out what it is, amid these fallacies and inconsistencies, that has secured the allegiance of millions, and has been a beacon of hope to the workers for more than a generation. Worthy opponents will seek to deal with Socialism, not in its weakest, but in its strongest aspects; and those who have fully realised the processes of social

evolution will be prepared to find Socialistic changes taking place under all those disguises by which men love to persuade themselves that the existing order is strong and "endureth forever." In England, especially, we shall find that the progress of Socialism is to be sought mainly among those who are unconscious of their Socialism, many of whom, indeed, still proclaim their adherence to Individualism, Self-help and Laissez Faire. But in any useful classification, position will not so much depend upon the label which a man gives to his opinions or actions as upon their actual character. Not all those who are now coming forward to claim the name of Socialist can be admitted as such, whilst many thousands have become Socialists without knowing it.

A well-considered and sober description of the Socialist Ideal, in its modern development, may be found in the following prospectus of one of the existing English Socialist organizations:

"The Fabian Society consists of Socialists. It therefore aims at the reorganization of society by the emancipation of land and industrial capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit. In this way only can the natural and

acquired advantages of the country be equitably shared by the whole people.

"The Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land, and of the consequent individual appropriation, in the form of rent, of the price paid for permission to use the earth, as well as for the advantages of superior soils and sites.

"The Society, further, works for the transfer to the community of the administration of such industrial capital as can conveniently be managed socially. For, owing to the monopoly of the means of production in the past, industrial inventions and the transformation of surplus income into capital have mainly enriched the proprietary class, the worker being now dependent on that class for leave to earn a living.

"If these measures be carried out, without compensation (though not without such relief to expropriated individuals as may seem fit to the community), rent and interest will be added to the reward of labour, the idle class now living on the labour of others will necessarily disappear, and practical equality of opportunity will be maintained by the spontaneous action of economic forces with much less interference with personal liberty than the present system entails.

"For the attainment of these ends, the Fabian Society looks to the spread of socialist opinions, and the social and political changes consequent thereon. It seeks to promote these by the general dissemination of knowledge as to the relation between the individual and society in its economic, ethical and political aspects."

This, however, affords merely a summary of the proper principles of social organization, and gives no account of the various modifications of

the existing society through which the ideal is likely to be attained. Another organization supplies this political forecast as follows :—

The Social-Democratic Federation urges for immediate adoption :—

"The Compulsory Construction of healthy artizans' and agricultural labourers' dwellings in proportion to the population, such dwellings to be let at rents to cover the cost of construction and maintenance alone.

"Free Compulsory Education for all classes, together with the provision of at least one wholesome meal a day in each school.

"Eight Hours or less to be the normal working day in all trades.

"Cumulative Taxation upon all incomes above a fixed minimum not exceeding £300 a year.

"State Appropriation of Railways; Municipal Control of Gas, Water and Tramway Companies.

"The establishment of National Banks which shall absorb all private institutions that derive a profit from operations in money or credit.

"Rapid Extinction of the National Debt.

"Nationalisation of the Land, and organisation of agricultural and industrial armies under State Control on Co-operative principles."

As means for the peaceable attainment of these objects the Social-Democratic Federation advocates:

"Payment of members; and Official Expenses of Election out of the Rates. Adult Suffrage. Annual Parliaments. Proportional Representation. Abolition of the House of Lords and all Hereditary Authorities. Disestablishment

and Disendowment of all State Churches. Extension of the Powers of County Councils." [1]

The above list is, however, neither complete nor conveniently classified, and is admittedly merely a rough general forecast of proposals which are indeed now rapidly being adopted by both political parties.

It may be summed up that the progress of Socialism in England has hitherto been, and is still being accomplished, in four leading directions, viz :

1. Constantly increasing restrictions upon the private ownership of land and capital. (Factory Acts, &c.)

2. Gradual supersession of private industrial ventures by public administration. (National Telegraphs, Municipal tramways, Parochial schools).

3. Progressive absorption by taxation of unearned incomes (rent and interest), and "rent of ability." (Income tax, taxes on real property, &c.)

4. The supplementing of private charity by public organisation, aiming at raising the con-

[1] (Programme and Rules of the Social-Democratic Federation as revised at the Annual Conference at Birmingham, August 5th, 1889.)

dition of the "residuum." (Public education, improved dwellings, &c.)

Philanthropic reformers will be surprised to find some of these measures classed as socialistic. They, as well as many Socialists, have been so accustomed to think of Socialism merely as an Ideal, that they do not recognize the steps by which that Ideal is being gradually realized. Wherever rent and interest are being absorbed under public control for public purposes, wherever the collective organization of the community is being employed in place of individual effort, wherever, in the public interest, the free use of private land or capital is being further restrained,—there one more step towards the complete realization of the Socialist Ideal is being taken. Society is reforming itself on Collectivist, not on Individualist principles, and although the advocates of each particular change intend no further alteration, the result is nevertheless an increasing social momentum in the same general direction.

The present tendency of English thought is strongly in favour of further development on these lines, and in the following pages some account will be given of this tendency, as ex-

hibited, not only in the avowed Socialist movement itself, but also in the Churches, at the Universities, among the economists, in legislation, in current politics, and in municipal life.

CHAPTER II.

THE RISE OF THE ENGLISH SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

IT is characteristic of England that although the present Socialist movement there, as a conscious popular agitation of any vitality, is scarcely more than eight years old, the progressive Socialism in English politics dates from the very beginning of the century.[1] Nothing like an adequate account of this development can here be attempted. It is easy to trace the fore-runners of the present movement, and that in more than one direction,[2] but it must more properly be regarded as the conscious and explicit expression of what has long been the growing force in England. It is true that with

[1] See the article on *Socialism in English Politics*, by William Clarke, in the *Political Science Quarterly*, December, 1888.

[2] The general course of this development is described in the essay on *The Historical Aspect* in *Fabian Essays in Socialism*. (Published by the Fabian Society, and by Walter Scott, London, price 1s.)

the collapse of the Chartist movement in 1848, all serious agitation of a Socialist character came to an end, and for thirty years popular aspirations in England took the forms of a development of trades unions, the progress of co-operative distributive stores and building societies, in conjunction with the purely political agitation for the Parliamentary franchise. But the Socialist leaven was still at work. The Chartist survivors continued to be centres of quiet education of their comrades. The ideas of Marx and Lassalle filtered in through French and German refugees, as well as through the personal influence of Marx himself on a select few. The latter influence of the Political Economists, notably that of John Stuart Mill,[1] gradually prepared the public mind for Socialist proposals, especially on the subject of the "unearned increment" of land values. The course of industrial development was bringing about the intervention of the legislature in every factory and in almost every trade. The growth of

[1] See the explicit confession of his conversion, as he says, from mere Democracy to Socialism (*Autobiography*, p. 231-2) and the change in tone shown in Book IV. of the *Political Economy*. (Popular Edition, 1865.)

democratic feeling was compelling the political enfranchisement of one class after another, of poorer and poorer citizens, until now almost as large a proportion of the population as in the United States itself, is registered as entitled to vote.

The constant denunciations of the current bourgeois ideals by the "Christian Socialists;" by Carlyle and his perpetually renewed stream of enthusiastic, if temporary, disciples; by Ruskin and many of his literary and artistic supporters, as well as by the small but persistent band of "Positivists," could not fail to exert a potent disintegrating force.

All this time popular education was progressing at an enormous rate, until the illiterate workman of the Chartist times has almost disappeared. The growth of knowledge of Politicial Economy made it constantly more apparent that the Radical ideal of "Equality of Opportunity" is absolutely impossible of attainment, even in infinite time, so long as individual ownership of land exists. It was, moreover, becoming apparent since 1867, that the mere possession of voting power did not suffice to cure the festering ulcers of urban poverty

and all sections of the popular party were ripe for the development of an avowedly Socialist policy.

The occasion out of which the movement arose was an unexpected one. Little as Mr. Henry George intended it, there can be no doubt that it was the enormous circulation of his "Progress and Poverty," which gave the touch which caused all the seething influences to crystallize into a popular Socialist movement. The optimistic and confident tone of the book, and the irresistible force of its popularization of Ricardo's Law of Rent, sounded the dominant "note" of the English Socialist party of to-day. Adherents of Mr. George's views gathered into little propagandist societies, and gradually developed, in many cases, into complete Socialists. During the year 1881, moreover, the coercive measures introduced by Mr. Gladstone's ministry against the Irish Land League had alienated many of the earnest Radicals from the Liberal party, and these were still further repelled by the "untoward events," which were happening in Egypt. It became evident that "Liberalism" was not inconsistent with shameless international aggression in the interests of

the officers and the bondholders. The years of Mr. Gladstone's administration were successfully frittered away without any real effort to accomplish social reforms. Even long promised fiscal reforms were quietly dropped, and not even an attempt was made until 1885 to redress financial iniquities long before admitted by Mr. Gladstone himself. The Land Tax remained unreformed. The Tea Duty remained unrepealed. The poor man seemed absolutely beyond the ken of the middle-class "party of progress." The neglect of English social questions became more and more pressingly felt, and it was mainly the feeling due to these political incidents that caused the first definitely Socialist organization to arise. This was a body called the "Democratic Federation," founded in March, 1881, by the efforts of Mr. H. M. Hyndman, Mr. Herbert Burrows, Miss Helen Taylor (stepdaughter of John Stuart Mill) and some others. Mr. Joseph Cowen, at that time member of Parliament for Newcastle-on-Tyne, a life-long Democrat, was one of the active helpers from the first, although this was not publicly known. The only distinctively Socialist proposal explicitly set forth in the first pro-

gramme of this organization was "Nationalization of the Land,"[1] placed ninth in the list, but it was from the first essentially a Socialist body, and it changed its name in September, 1883, to the "Social Democratic Federation." Under this title it became a propagandist organization of great effect in London, and many of the provincial industrial centres, having scores of energetic and self-supporting local branches. It is undoubtedly due to the bold and unsparing personal efforts made by the early leaders of

[1] This was not borrowed from Mr. George. It had long been one of the proposals of English Democratic leaders; such, for instance, as Bronterre O'Brien. Something very like it was at the back of the Chartist movement. The 'Land and Labour League," a popular organization of fifteen years ago, made it the most prominent of its demands. The idea seems to have been originally that of Thomas Spence, whose lecture on the subject in 1775, has been republished by Mr. Hyndman (*The Nationalization of the Land in* 1775 *and* 1882. London, 1882. E. W. Allen.) Professor Ogilvie, of Aberdeen, published similar doctrines in 1782. *Carpenter's Political Magazine*, published in 1831, contains a series of articles on "Social Reform," in which the principle is clearly stated (see *Financial Reformer*, Nov. 1889.) The *Theory of Human Progression* by Patrick Edward Dove, published in 1850, and this author's *Elements of Political Science*, published in 1854, appear to contain the same ideas. But no doubt Mr. George worked them out quite independently.

this society that Socialism has become widely known in England. Many mistakes were made, and there was much wild talk, but those who criticize should remember both the difficulties and the provocations of the situation. Middle class England shuddered at the very idea of Socialism, and had to be compelled to listen. But the movement progressed in spite of all blunders. Other Socialist societies arose, by fission, or by differentiation, until the influence of Socialism upon Democratic thought and politics has become admittedly enormous. The change in tone of English political leaders since 1880, is obvious and daily increasing, until it is not too much to assert that the Radical party, largely the creation of the Individualist Philosophers of seventy years ago, is now thoroughly permeated with Socialist ideas. The numerical increase of nominal Socialists is hindered by this very success. Those, who in Germany would naturally be enrolled as members of the Social Democratic party, in England still call themselves Liberals or Radicals, but demand such Socialist measures as the "municipalization" of urban land, the special taxation of rents and mining royalties, and the public provision of

artisans' dwellings. This permeation is apparently destined to continue, and the avowed Socialist party in England will probably remain a comparatively small disentegrating and educational force, never itself exercising political power, but supplying ideas and principles of social reconstruction to each of the great political parties in turn, as the changing results of English politics bring them alternately into office.

So steady and gradual is this permeation that few Radicals realise how far they have already travelled from the principles upon which their party was founded, and to which it still frequently professes to adhere. This very ignorance and repudiation is, of course, the most striking evidence of the change which has come over political thought. So ashamed is adult Radicalism of its political swaddling clothes, that it even denies their former existence. It will be convenient to set forth in parallel columns some of the more striking differences between the principles of the Radicalism of 1840-1874, into which Whiggism and Liberalism have merged, and those of the current Socialist Radicalism of the present day.

INDIVIDUALIST RADICALISM, 1840-1874.	SOCIALIST RADICALISM, 1889.
"That the best government is that which governs least."	"That the best government is that which can safely and successfully administer most."
Corollary.—Wherever you can make a "soft place" for a contractor, do so.	*Corollary.*—Wherever the collective organisation of the community can dispense with a contractor or other "entrepreneur," it should do so.
"That the utmost possible scope should be allowed to individual enterprise in industry."	"That, wherever possible, industries of widespread public service should be organised and controlled for the public benefit."
Corollary.—The best social use to which you can turn a profitable monopoly is to hand it over to some lucky individual to make a fortune out of it.	*Corollary.*—Every industry yielding more than a fair remuneration to the actual managers should be "municipalized" or "nationalized," or else specially taxed.
"That open competition and complete freedom from legal restrictions furnish the best guarantees of a healthy industrial community."	"That only by gradually increasing legal restrictions can the worst competitors be prevented from ousting their better rivals."
Corollary.—John Bright's opinion that adulteration is only a form of competition: the "individualism" of Mr. Auberon Herbert.	*Corollary.*—"The answer of modern statesmanship is that unfettered individual competition is not a principle to which the regulation of industry may be entrusted." (Mr. John Morley, "Life of Cobden," Vol. I., ch. xiii., 298.)

"That the desired end of 'equality of opportunity' can be ultimately reached by allowing to each person the complete ownership of any riches he may become possessed of."	"That Political Economy indubitably proves 'equality of opportunity' to be absolutely impossible of even approximate attainment, so long as complete private ownership exists in land and other economic monopolies."
Corollary.—The policy of the "Liberty and Property Defence League."	*Corollary.*—The policy of "Nationalization" or "Municipalization" of Land and other economic monopolies.
"That the best possible social state will result from each individual pursuing his own interest in the way he thinks best."	"That social health is something apart from and above the interest of individuals, and must be consciously pursued as an end in itself."
Corollary.—"Private vices, public benefits."	*Corollary.*—The study of the science of sociology, and of the art of politics.

It follows, as a consequence of the permeation already referred to, that Radicals often deny that the above principles were really those of their predecessors. They discover now-a-days exceptions and qualifications which were not present to the minds of the "Manchester School." Individualist Radicalism is, in fact, not only dead, but even largely forgotten.

CHAPTER III.

THE ENGLISH SOCIALIST ORGANISATIONS.

THE difficulty in describing the English Socialist organisations is their constant fluidity. Their programmes and principles remain, and even their leaders, but their active membership is continually changing. A steady stream of persons influenced by Socialist doctrines passes into them, but after a time most of these cease to attend meetings the subjects of which have become familiar, and gradually discontinue their subscriptions. These persons are not lost to the movement: they retain their Socialist tone of thought, and give effect to it in their trades unions, their clubs, and their political associations. But they often cease to belong to any distinctly Socialist organisation, where they are replaced by newer converts.

The character of the organisations themselves is no less unstable. It was intended, in almost every case, that they should be federal

in form, the Executive consisting of delegates from the local "branches." As a matter of fact they have really consisted of propagandist committees, usually in London, with more or less organised knots of adherents in other parts of London and in certain provincial towns. It need hardly be said that petty jealousies and personal quarrels have not been wanting in this as in every other popular movement, and its organisation has constantly suffered from these causes. The so-called "branches" fluctuate continually in strength, and vary in character from almost independent autonomous and self-supporting societies, down to mere centres to which lecturers are supplied, and through which literature is distributed. Neither the size nor the number of these "branches" is of so much importance as the existence, in many constituencies, of a few energetic political workers who see the weakness of the programmes of the great political parties, and who, knowing precisely what they want, and giving voice to the vague popular feeling, are able to exercise an altogether disproportionate influence on the candidates and party managers. It is the weight of the Socialist criticism of the merely "poli

tical" programmes of both parties, not its numerical strength, which has made it, under one name or another, the most potent influence in English politics to-day.

The largest as well as the oldest of the existing socialist societies in England, is the Social Democratic Federation. Founded by a small number of educated middle-class reformers, it became, almost from the first, a democratic and popular body, and to it belong the great majority of the avowed Socialists of the wage-earning class. It consists nominally of a central council of delegates, sitting in London, and about 30 "branches" in London and most of the large provincial towns. Each of these branches carries on an active local propaganda by means of incessant lectures, open-air meetings and the sale of literature. Some of them bring, in addition, considerable pressure to bear on current politics by influencing candidates, and by running candidates of their own at local elections. This influence has been particularly successful at Battersea (London), where Mr. John Burns, the local leader, was in 1889 returned at the head of the poll for the London County Council, and at

Newcastle-on-Tyne, where three Socialists were in the same year elected to the School Board in face of the combined opposition of all other parties, religious, educational and political. The Council in London maintains friendly relations with the Socialist party in other countries, issues manifestos on matters of current interest, organises demonstrations in London, and maintains a weekly newspaper, "Justice," (price one penny) which has the largest circulation of any Socialist periodical. In economics it professes to follow Karl Marx; in politics it is "collectivist" as well as extremely democratic, and is marked by a tone of bitter repudiation of both liberal and conservative politicians. It denounces especially the "Conservatism" of the trades union leaders, and the working members of Parliament, as well as the "Jingo" foreign policy carried on by both great parties in the interests of capitalists and the aristocracy.

The most active members of the Social Democratic Federation are Mr. H. M. Hyndman,[1]

[1] Graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge; author of *The Historical Basis of Socialism* (London, 1883; Kegan Paul & Co.); *The Bankruptcy of India* (London 1886,

Mrs. Annie Besant[1] and Mr. Herbert Burrows.

The central office of the Social Democratic Federation is 337 Strand, London. Among their more important issues may be named "Socialism Made Plain" (71st thousand), "The Socialist Catechism," by J. L. Joynes, M. A. (20th thousand). Mr. Hyndman's "A Commune for London," and "The Emigration Fraud"

Swan, Sonnenschein & Co.) *England for all* (London, 1881; E. W. Allen); *The Coming Revolution in England* (London, W. Reeves): *Socialism and Slavery* (London, Modern Press); and many other pamphlets and articles on Socialism.

[1] The well known author and lecturer, late co-editor with Mr Charles Bradlaugh, M.P., of *The National Reformer*, vice-president of the National Secular Society and of the Malthusian League; secretary of the Matchmakers' Trade Union; member of the Fabian Society and of the Social Democratic Federation; member of the London School Board (returned at the top of the poll for the Tower Hamlet Division, November, 1888); prosecuted with Mr. Bradlaugh in 1877, for publishing Dr. Knowlton's *Fruits of Philosophy*; because of her atheistic and Malthusian opinions deprived in 1878 of the custody of her daughter, a "ward of court," by order of the court of chancery; author of *My Path to Atheism*, *The Law of Population*, *Autobiographical Sketches*, *Modern Socialism*, and numerous Freethought, Political and Socialist pamphlets and essays. (Freethought Publishing Co., 63 Fleet Street, London).

(one penny each); "The Principles of Socialism," by Mr. Hyndman and Mr. Morris, price fourpence; Prince Kropotkine's "Appeal to the Young," and Karl Marx' "Wage-Labour and Capital" (one penny each).

The other large popular organization in England is the "Socialist League," founded in 1883 by Mr. William Morris,[1] who has been one of the active members of the Social Democratic Federation. The grounds of his secession were mainly personal, but the new body developed important differences as to the method of advancing the Socialist cause. Whilst accepting the collectivist principle of public control over the instruments of wealth production, the Socialist League insists strongly upon the necessity of this control being exercised by free communal groups, only loosely and voluntarily associated in larger aggregates. On this ground it has often leanings towards the "Anarchist" section, in resisting the tendency to an over-centralized administration, to which collectivists are prone. This attitude is emphasized by the

[1] The eminent poet and art worker, author of *The Earthly Paradise* and many other poems. His chief Socialist publication is *Signs of Change*, a series of lectures. (London, 1889, Reeves & Turner).

repugnance of its leader to the machinery and methods of current politics which causes it to confine itself to the dissemination of the Socialist principles and ideal, without endeavouring directly to influence the actual mode of their application to the current social evolution. This purely educational attitude which gives most of the publications of the League somewhat of an "Utopian" character, whilst not unattractive to students, and to literary and artistic workers, fails to interest the mass of the wage-workers. On the other hand, it attracts most of the foreign Socialist refugees in this country, who have brought from the continent a distrust of the merely "bourgeois" politics of French and German Liberalism. These give the Socialist League a disposition occasionally to coquet vaguely with those "counsels of despair" to which the oppressed classes are prone when hope of political regeneration dies out among them; and while such influences inflame the prevalent feeling against the feeble and hesitating efforts of even the Radical political leaders, they prevent the League finding adherents among the ordinary working men.[1] It

[1] This is typical of the change of thought among the

is accordingly diminishing in numerical strength, and many of its members have fallen away to set up separate local organizations or to join other bodies.

The Socialist League is nominally organised on a plan similar to that of the Social Democratic Federation, with a central council and a number of local branches. These have, however, latterly become much less numerous.

The organ of the League is the "Commonweal," published weekly, price one penny. This has now a smaller circulation than "Justice," but it often contains poems and articles of high literary merit. It is marked

masses. The Trades Union leaders still belong, in great measure, to the school of Individualist Radicalism, out of which their followers have already passed, and the leaders' dislike and distrust of political action causes them, as it does the Socialist League, occasionally to throw themselves into the hands of the wilder revolutionary party. This happened, for instance, at the international Trades Union Congress in London in November, 1888, when the English delegates coalesced with the Foreign Anarchists, rather than support the mildly "collectivist" proposals as to the legislative shortening of the hours of labour. (See Mr. Adolphe Smith's *Critical Essay* on the Congress; London, 19 Barclay Road, Walham Green.) A great advance was, however, shown by those Trades Unionists who represented England in the annual Congress at Paris in 1889.

by an equally acrid denunciation of all politicians, and it may be added that, with doubtful wisdom, both papers unite in attacking Mr. Henry George, and the Land Nationalisation movement generally.

The most active member of the Socialist League, besides Mr. William Morris, is Mr. E. Belfort Bax.[1]

The head office of the Socialist League is at 24 Great Queen Street, W.C., London, but its most important centre is Mr. Morris' residence, Kelmscott House, Upper Mall, Hammersmith, London. Its chief publications other than the lectures of Mr. Morris and Mr. Bax, already mentioned, are "The Manifesto of the Socialist League" (price one penny,) and a series of rather inflammatory leaflets for free distribution.

The Fabian Society occupies a different sphere as a Socialist society from that of the two larger bodies. It was founded in 1883 as an educational and propagandist centre, and

[1] Author of a *History of Philosophy*, a biography of Jean Paul Marat, and other philosophical and historical works; editor of Bohn's edition of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, author of *The Religion of Socialism*, *The Ethics of Socialism*, and many other socialist writings.

includes members of all the other organisations, with a number of active workers chiefly of the middle class, and "literary proletariat." It furnishes lecturers in considerable number to all meetings where Socialism, in any guise whatsoever, can possibly be introduced, and its own fortnightly discussions have been useful in formulating and adapting Socialist principles in relation to actual contemporary conditions. Two of its members were elected in 1888 on the London School Board. The Society exercises a considerable influence, more real than apparent, by the personal participation of its members in nearly all reform movements, as well as by their work at the Universities and in the fields of journalism and the teaching of Political Economy. It is not, however, a numerous body, and makes no attempt to increase its numbers beyond a convenient limit. Its influence on the Socialist movement has been marked by the present predominance of the ideas of gradual social evolution, and the importance of correct economic analysis. The address of the Secretary is 180 Portsdown Road, London. The chief publication of the Society, is the series of lectures published in

January 1890, price 6s., entitled "*Fabian Essays in Socialism.*" This is a complete exposition of modern English Socialism in its latest and maturest phase. The book consists of eight monographs by Socialists who are known as practical speakers, writers, and political workers. The relation of Socialism to economic and moral science is dealt with by G. Bernard Shaw and Sydney Olivier, B.A.; its evolution, as traced in the history of politics and industry, by Sidney Webb, LL.B., and William Clarke, M.A.; its effect on political parties in the immediate future, by Hubert Bland; its consequences upon property and industry, by Graham Wallas, M.A. and Annie Besant. The practical steps by which the transition to Social Democracy is likely to be completed are the subject of a separate essay, by G. Bernard Shaw, which was prepared at the request of the officers of the economic section of the British Association, and read at the Bath meeting in September 1888.

The fullest account of the practical proposals of Socialists for dealing with the pressing social problems of the metropolis is given in "Facts for Londoners" (Fabian Tract No. 8, price

sixpence), which contains an enormous mass of official statistics and other trustworthy information on all London affairs.

The other publications of the society which are still in print are (No. 1) "Why are the many poor?" (one shilling per 100); (No. 5.) "Facts for Socialists from the Political Economists and Statisticians;" (No. 7) "Capital and Land;" and (No. 9) "An Eight Hours Bill in the form of an Amendment of the Factory Acts" (price one penny each). All these can be obtained from the Secretary, 180 Portsdown Road, London, W., or at 63 or 185 Fleet Street, E.C.

The Christian Socialist Society consists of Socialists who desire to lay special stress upon the fact that the doctrines and principles of Christianity, as taught by Jesus Christ, necessarily involve a Socialistic state of society. The members consist largely of ministers of religion of various denominations all over the country, who give effect to their views in frequent sermons and religious writings. One of them was in 1889 elected unopposed to the County Council of Staffordshire. The "Christian Socialist," a monthly newspaper, is practically

maintained by the adherents of the society, under the editorship of Mr. W. H. P. Campbell (8 Lorne Villas, Brockley Road, Forest Hill, London, S. E.). Their other chief publication is a pamphlet, "Social Reformation on Christian Principles" (price one penny), in which the case for Socialist reforms is ably stated from a religious point of view. The tone of the newspaper, as well as of the Society's publications, is that of broad unsectarian Christianity, with great insistance upon the moral obligation of the individual, and the necessity of unselfish subordination to the common weal.

The four organizations already mentioned are the only existing definitely Socialist bodies of more than local influence. The "Guild of St. Matthew" will be noticed in connection with "Socialism in the Churches." Several local societies are, however, of considerable importance. In London, the Battersea branch of the Social Democratic Federation has become almost an independent society, completely dominating the political life of the important industrial constituency in which it is situated. (Office, Sydney Hall, 36 York Road, Batter-

sea.) It is probable that a Socialist member of Parliament will be returned there at the next election, in place of the present capitalist Liberal representative.

It is significant of the attitude of the Liberal party towards Socialism that, immediately after the triumphant election of Mr. John Burns to the London County Council for the constituency of Battersea, its Liberal Member of Parliament announced that he would not again contest the seat. Owing to local jealousies, a Liberal candidate was actually chosen, but every possible pressure was brought to bear upon him and his supporters by the Liberal leaders and organizers, in order that the way might be clear for the Socialist candidate, who alone stands any chance of success. No attempt is made by any Liberal leader to oppose or withstand Mr. Burns' triumphant progress.

An active former "branch" of the Socialist League has now become the Bloomsbury Socialist Society, having differed from the parent organization in desiring to take part in current politics. It is now carrying on an independent existence, its meetings taking place at 49 Tottenham Street, Tottenham Court Road.

It is, however, more significant as marking the growth of dissatisfaction with all non-political methods, than for its size or strength.

In the provinces the independent societies at Bristol and Sheffield deserve special notice. The "Clifton and Bristol Christian Socialist Society" is mainly a middle class body, with frankly democratic sympathies. It has exercised considerable influence in its own locality, its secretary (Mr. H. H. Gore, 22 Clare Street, Bristol,) having been elected a member of the Bristol School Board, and afterwards a member of the Town Council, after a sharp contest in each case.

The "Sheffield Socialists" derive much of their inspiration from Mr. Edward Carpenter,[1] their most prominent member, and exhibit a tendency to Ruskinian Socialism, not free from influences akin to those emanating from Thoreau on the one hand, and from Tolstoi on the other. The duties of citizenship are, however, not neglected, and here a second Socialist (Rev. Charles Peach) was elected on the School

[1] Author of *Towards Democracy*, *England's Ideal*, *Civilization, its Cause and Cure*, (Socialist Lectures) and other works. (London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co).

Board in 1889, Mr. Jonathan Taylor having occupied that position for some years.

The development of Socialism among the Northumberland miners and the workers of Tyneside has been specially interesting. This district is, in many respects, the most prosperous industrial centre in England, and the miners, in particular, by a well organized trades union and successful co-operative societies, stand almost at the head of the so-called "aristocracy of labour." Both the Social Democratic Federation and the Socialist League have pushed their propaganda with great vigour in all the populous centres. Numerous branches have been formed, which at one time possessed a local federal organization, and a large number of members have been at various times enrolled. Their influence was seen in the warning vote of "want of confidence" passed on the "Miners' Member" of Parliament (Mr. T. Burt), which was, however, afterwards rescinded, and, more recently, in the triumphant election, already referred to, of three Socialists to the Newcastle School Board. The Socialist movement in this district has now, however, become almost merged, as far as organization and machinery are concerned,

in the growing "Labour Party," which is stronger as a conscious force in Newcastle than anywhere else.

The "Labour Party" is the product of the popular dissatisfaction on the one hand with the "middle class politics" of the provincial Liberal, and on the other, with the long prevalent abstention of the Trades Unions from ordinary political work. Various attempts have been and continue to be made to form a "Third Party," but these have hitherto resulted chiefly in increasing the wide-spread belief that the wage-earning class has little reason to care for one political party more than another. The various "labour parties" have not hitherto been powerful in numerical strength. The American "Knights of Labour" have been imitated in an organization in the midland industrial centres. The "Labour Federation" about Tyneside is a similar movement. The "Labour Electoral Association" endeavours to organize a "labour vote," and is of some strength at Newcastle, where Mr. John Morley, M.P., has been already driven by the local society to declare a much more advanced programme than hitherto promulgated by him. The

programme of the Newcastle "Labour Electoral Organization," has accordingly become of some general interest, and as it is typical of them all, it is given below, with these special local demands :—

PARLIAMENTARY PROGRAMME.

1—Adult suffrage, with abolition of plural voting.

2—Triennial Parliaments, the elections to be all on one day.

3—Payment of Members by the State, and of official election expenses from the rates.

4—Second Ballot, to ensure the representation of majority.

5—Nationalisation of land and minerals.

6—Free compulsory education: Boards to have power to provide free meals for the children.

7—Home Rule for each separate nationality of country demanding it, in the British Empire, with an Imperial Parliament for Imperial affairs.

8—Labour Legislation: (*a*) an Eight Hours Act; (*b*) Reform of present Poor Law system, and creation of State Insurance for sickness, accident, superannuation and death; (*c*) Weekly Pays; (*d*) Application of Factories' and Workshops' Act to all premises, whether public or private, in which work is performed.

9—State acquisition of Railways and other means of transit.

10—Complete control of liquor traffic by the Ratepayers.

11—Abolition of the House of Lords and of all other hereditary offices.

12—Simplification and codification of the Civil and Criminal Law, and free administration of justice to all classes alike.

MUNICIPAL PROGRAMME.

1—To acquire and work for the benefit of the public all monopolies which minister to the convenience of the citizens, and especially; (*a*) Supply of Water; (*b*) Supply of Gas or Electric light; (*c*) Tramways.

2—To secure for the citizens freedom from the antiquated nuisance of tolls, by acquiring, freeing, or building substitutes for: (*a*) the Byker Bridge; (*b*) the Redheugh Bridge; (*c*) the High Level Bridge; (*d*) and all other tolls on the approaches to the city.

3—To put into immediate operation the Artizans Dwellings Act by the erection of good dwellings to be let at a rate to cover cost and maintenance alone, on the Walker estate, or elsewhere.

4—To create a labour exchange for male and female workers, including domestic servants.

5—To increase the utility of the Public Free Library by instituting Branches in various districts of the city.

6—To institute a Public Gallery of Art.

7—To build restaurants with facilities for workmen to transact business on the same principle as the Public Baths.

8—To build a Public Gymnasium, and provide all the public parks with complete gymnastic appliances.

These empirical "labour" programmes represent in some sense a reaction against the more theoretic visions of the earlier Socialist speeches, and they are in some cases the direct

results of a better realisation by Socialists themselves of the means and difficulties of social progress. There can be no doubt that most of the measures thus crudely adumbrated, will be gradually adopted by the Liberal party and some of them possibly by the Conservatives.

The most prominent workers in the so-called "Labour" movement are Messrs. Cunninghame Graham, M.P., H. H. Champion, John Burns, L.C,C.,[1] Tom Mann, (Amalgamated Engineers), J. Keir Hardie, (Ayrshire Miners), T. R. Threlfall (Lancashire), and Alexander Stewart (Newcastle School Board).

Mr. H. H. Champion was for some years an active worker for the Social-Democratic Fed-

[1] A working engineer, with a magnificent gift of oratory and extraordinary capacity for organization and leadership; long one of the leading members of the Social-Democratic Federation, from which he has now resigned; unsuccessful as a Socialist candidate for Parliament at Nottingham, 1885; prosecuted for sedition in April, 1886, but acquitted; convicted of "unlawful assembly" and obstructing the police at Trafalgar Square, "Bloody Sunday," November 13, 1887, and imprisoned; triumphantly elected to the London County Council by Battersea, January, 1889; organizer and leader of the dock and other strikes, 1889; accepted by the Liberal Association of Battersea as their candidate for Parliament, though standing frankly as a "Social Democrat.'

eration, but his conduct being disapproved, he was expelled, and now carries on an agitation independently, the chief aim of which is the legislative shortening of the hours of labour. He has taken the leading part in trying to enforce the "Shop Hours Regulation Act," passed in 1886 at the instance of Sir John Lubbock, M.P. His newspaper, "The Labour Elector" (Modern Press, 13 Paternoster Row, London, weekly, price one penny), has now a considerable circulation, and is mainly devoted to the advocacy of an "Eight Hours' Bill," and the exposure and denunciation of capitalist members of the Liberal party.

The whole "Labour movement" received during 1889 an immense impetus from (1) the successful intervention of the Working Men's Clubs and Trades' Unions in the London School Board and County Council Elections; (2) the general success and reasonable moderation of the International Trades' Union Congress at Paris; and, above all, (3) the remarkable series of strikes mostly led and organized by Mr. John Burns, L.C.C.

The success of Socialist candidates at the School Board and County Council elections has

already been referred to, but an even greater effect has been produced upon public opinion by the decision of both these bodies not to allow any of their work to be executed by firms not paying the standard wages, and otherwise conforming to the standard usages of each trade. This decision, which has been sternly adhered to, is much strengthening the influence of the Trades' Unions, and is going far to establish a "moral minimum" rate of wages.

The International Trades' Union Congress at Paris, though frowned upon by the more old-fashioned of the English leaders, received widespread support from labour organizations of all kinds, including many Socialist bodies. Its proceedings were marred by an unfortunate split between the so-called "Possibilists," and the "Marxists," but they have greatly facilitated the general labour movement by resulting, almost with international unanimity, in the following moderate and practicable "labour programme," which is being pressed for simultaneously in all industrially developed countries.

1. Eight hours a day to be the maximum of the day's work fixed by international law. 2.

At least one day's holiday to be given each week, and no work to be done on fête days. 3. Abolition of night work as far as practicable for men, and entirely for women and children. 4. The total suppression of labour by children under the age of fourteen, and protection of children up to the age of eighteen. 5. Complete technical and professional education. 6. Overtime to be paid for at double rates, and limited to four hours in twenty-four. 7. Civil and criminal responsibility of the employers for accidents. 8. An adequate number of qualified inspectors to be nominated by the workers themselves, and paid by the State or the commune, with full power to enter workshops, factories, or religious establishments at any time, and to examine the apprentices at their own homes. 9. Workshops to be organised by the workers with subsidies from the municipalities or the State. 10. Prison and workhouse labour to be conducted under the same condition as free labour, and to be employed as far as possible on great public works. 11. No foreign labourers to be allowed to accept employment, and no employers to be allowed to employ such labourers, at rates of wages

below the trade union rates fixed for their trade. 12. A minimum wage to be fixed in every country, in accordance with a reasonable standard of living. 13. The abrogation of all laws against the international organization of labour. 14. Equal pay and opportunities for women and men for equal work.

The significant new development in labour disputes is the victory of the weak, through general public sympathy with their demands.

The first of the recent strikes was that of the girls employed in making lucifer matches. They form one of the commonest grades of labour, and they possessed absolutely no organization of any kind. Attention having been directed to their hardships by Mrs. Besant, the whole of these workers employed by Bryant and May (Limited) came out on strike in 1888 without funds, without organization and without leaders. No labour revolt ever seemed more hopeless. But by dint of almost unceasing labour, Mrs. Besant organized, controlled and directed the most successful strike of modern times. Public opinion practically ostracised the Directors of the Company; the conscience, or at any rate, the fear of the

shareholders was touched; the Liberal party leaders, for the first time in the history of labour, were compelled to take an active, though a hidden part, and the Liberal "whip," (Mr. Arnold Morley, M.P.) actually used personal pressure on the Liberal members of Parliament and other politicians who found themselves involved as shareholders. The London Trades Council, for the first time, took up the cause of unskilled labour, and threatened a universal "boycott." The Directors ignominiously collapsed, and a new era in the labour war was inaugurated.

The next important conflict was that of the gas stokers. Having formed a union, the London men struck for a reduction of their hours of labour from 12 to 8 per day, with some minor improvements. This strike was completely successful, and the fact that the Gas Companies were by the shortening of hours immediately compelled to engage several thousand additional men, is likely to be long remembered as a powerful argument in favour of the "Eight Hours Bill." The gas stokers in the municipal gas-works at Bristol, Leeds, etc., shortly afterwards obtained the same boon.

The example of the gas stokers proved contagious. The London dock-labourers, probably the very "residuum" of London labour, had long been slowly organizing into a union, under Mr. B. Tillett, and in August, 1889, some ten thousand of them struck, closing every dock in London. Nearly the whole of the riverside labourers, including especially the stevedores and the lightermen, struck in sympathy, and the whole trade of the world's greatest port was absolutely stopped. The strike was admirably led and managed by Messrs. Burns, Tillett and Mann; but only the widespread public sympathy with the strikers made it successful. Public disapproval hindered the Dock Companies from obtaining sufficient "blacklegs" to take the strikers' place; public subscriptions of £48,000 enabled Burns to organize a splendid system of "strike pay," which bribed every East End "loafer" not to offer himself; and finally the concentrated pressure of editors, clergymen, shareholders, shipowners and merchants enabled Cardinal Manning and Mr. Sydney Buxton, M.P., as "arbitrators," to compel the Dock Directors to concede practically the whole of the men's demands, a delay

of six weeks being granted to allow of the new arrangements being made. Two further incidents of this strike must be noted, as profoundly affecting public opinion. The "docker's tanner"—sixpence per hour—became marked out as the "moral minimum" London wage. And over £30,000 was subscribed to the strike fund in Australia, and remitted by telegraph. The electric cable has at last made labour questions international.

The political effect of this series of incidents has been momentous. The political centre of gravity has been finally and decisively shifted from the middle class to the wage earners—from the provincial industrial centres to London. The result has already been seen in the rapidly accelerating plunge of the Liberal party into an almost avowed Socialism.

Nothing need be said of other movements of Socialist import in various parts of England, most of which are much behind the Metropolis in this respect.

Description of the English socialist organisations would however be incomplete without mention of the "Anarchist" section,[1] although

[1] It is necessary to explain to the candid student that the

this is infinitesimal in numbers. The high personal character and intellectual attainments of its leaders enable it to command a respect which neither its strength nor its doctrines would otherwise procure.

The English "Anarchists," unlike many of the American, and some of the Continental, claimants of that misleading appellation, are advocates of a free and voluntary communism, regulated only by moral suasion. They do not overlook the imperfect moral nature of existing humanity, but they lay great stress on the undoubted fact that many of our selfish and anti-social feelings are fostered by the existing competitive and authoritative system, and might be expected to disappear with it. Some of them admit that a free communism is only a remote ideal, to be reached only after a considerable development of Collectivism, but their practical tendency is usually against further advances of collective activity. The constant autonomy of the individual needs, they think, to be increased

"Anarchist" is, in no respect, an advocate of what is commonly known as "anarchy." He is so far from being a mere "criminal lunatic" that his main defect may be characterised as being "too good for this world."

rather than diminished, even if the restriction originates at the desire of the individual himself.

The chief exponents in England of this scientific "Anarchism" are Prince Kropotkine[1] and Mrs. C. M. Wilson, and there is issued a monthly journal of uncertain vitality entitled "Freedom" (London, 19 Cursitor street—price one penny.)

There are various other groups and minor organizations of Socialists, of a local and usually extremely fluctuating character. But, as has been already explained, by far the largest part of English Socialism is unconscious of itself as Socialism, and the avowed exponents of the principle appear, on a mere superficial glance, to be of quite minor importance in English public life.

The movement for Land Nationalization proper is largely participated in by Socialists, but maintains two independent organisations of

[1] Prince Kropotkine's services to science and to prison reform are well-known. His most important socialist contribution is a most eloquent pamphlet entitled *Aux jeunes gens*, translated into English under the title of *An Appeal to the Young.* (London: The Modern Press, and Social Democratic Federation.)

importance. The "Land Nationalization Society" (London, 11 Southampton Street, Strand), has for its principal exponent the eminent naturalist, Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace, who now declares himself a Socialist. A monthly organ of this Society was started in Nov. 1889, under the title "Land and Labour" (price one penny). The "English Land Restoration League" (London, 8 Duke Street, Adelphi), a very vigorous organization of widespread influence, adheres more closely to the principles of Mr. Henry George. The Rev. J. E. Symes, Professor of Political Economy at University College, Nottingham, author of "A Short Text-book of Political Economy" (London, Rivingtons, 1888), is a member of the Council of this body, which also includes several members of Parliament. Not a few Liberal candidates for Parliament now boldly declare themselves in favour of Land Nationalization, much to the disgust, it need hardly be said, of their more cautious supporters. But the avowal is found to "pay," and the election, in Oct. 1889, of Mr. Seymour Keay as member for Elgin and Nairn, upon the declared platform of complete Land Nationalization, in spite

of the defection of middle-class Liberals, produced a considerable sensation in official Liberal ranks.

The accepted method of land nationalization is the taxation of rental values, and the "Joint Committee for the Taxation of Ground Rents and Values," (London 18 Bouverie Street, E. C.), formed by the English Land Restoration League, in conjunction with the London Municipal Reform League, has enjoyed in succession the presidency of Lord Hobhouse, K.C.S.I., and Earl Compton, M.P., and has succeeded in enlisting nearly all the Liberal (and some Conservative) members of Parliament in support of the special taxation of urban land values. Its first important publication "A Plea for the Taxation of Ground Rents," (price twopence) was, at the request of the Committee, written by a Socialist, and the arguments used therein support the complete Nationalization or Municipalization of all Rent. A second pamphlet dealing with the question in more detail, has been prepared by Mr. Fletcher Moulton, Q.C. (late M.P. for Clapham). This committee, presenting its aims in the moderate and practical way dear to the English mind, has already ex-

ercised a most potent influence, and at least two-thirds of the members of the London County Council adopt its programme. The movement for the absorption by taxation of the site value of great cities is making enormous strides, and the lectures of Mr. Henry George during his visit in 1889 were presided over by Liberal members of Parliament and candidates for that honour, as well as by ministers and other leaders of the great Nonconformist religious bodies, who, on his two former visits, usually regarded his doctrines with horror and contempt.

The Financial Reform Association, a mainly capitalist organization founded by Cobden and Bright for the abolition of customs duties, has been completely swept into the current set up by Mr. Henry George, and its monthly organ, the "Financial Reformer," now presses frankly and persistently for an immediate imposition of a 25 per cent. tax on the full annual value of land, which, as it says, would at once absorb over forty millions sterling annually of the rent now paid to individual proprietors. This association receives the support of a large number of Liberal Members of Parliament and

associations, by whose aid it carries on a vigorous campaign all over the country.

The special rating and taxation of urban land values, the amount being left unspecified, is indeed now fully accepted as a part of the official Liberal programme, and this fact is the more significant of the popular pressure in that probably not one of the present Liberal leaders really desires or intends any such "confiscatory" taxation, though they take no trouble to disclaim it. By the people at large the mere landlord is recognised, as Matthew Arnold put it, as a costly anachronism whose moral claim even to compensation for expropriation is constantly getting weaker. The Irish landlord has absolutely no friends, and in defence of Irish rents, the English landlord is fast jeopardising his own position. A large Irish land purchase scheme, if forced upon England and Scotland, would probably so ripen opinion on the subject as immediately to bring the British land question into practical politics.

In Scotland the Socialist propaganda has had a success corresponding to that in England, and there have been, from time to time, active "branches" in all the industrial centres. The "Scottish

Land and Labour League" has become a definitely Socialist organization, and the Land Nationalization movement, which is very widespread, is every day taking on more of a Socialist character. The most influential Scotch Socialists are perhaps, the Reverend John Glasse (Presbyterian), Old Grey Friars Church, Edinburgh, and Professor Mavor, who holds the chair of Political Economy in St. Mungo's College, Glasgow. The chief Socialist organization in Scotland is now the "Scottish Socialist Federation," meeting at the Moulder's Hall, 105 High Street, Edinburgh.

Ireland has not proved a successful field for avowed and conscious Socialist propaganda, in consequence, no doubt, of its relatively backward industrial development. The whole tendency of the Parnellite movement is in favour of ultimate peasant proprietorship, and hardly anyone among the popular leaders, except Mr. Michael Davitt, recognises the necessity even of Land Nationalization. It need, however, hardly be said that the Irish land movement has struck a heavy blow against landlordism, and it may very likely prove to be the case that this attack on "private property" will carry the

Irish leaders, as it has their English supporters, to lengths as yet unsuspected by themselves. There is a Dublin Progressist Club, of Socialist sympathies, but of small influence, at 87 Montgomery Street, Dublin.

CHAPTER IV.

Socialism in the Churches.

In spite of numerous statements to the contrary, it is apparent that Socialism in England is by no means an atheistic or irreligious movement. It is true that many prominent Socialists are agnostics or atheists, but the same remark could be made of every reform movement. One or two enthusiastic Socialists have gone so far as to denounce Clericalism, and even Christianity, as the necessary enemies of the Democracy. But the movement on the whole has kept itself remarkably clear of theological controversies, and every Socialist society includes numbers of earnest Christians.

The Christians have, indeed, not been backward in taking their own part in the movement. The "Christian Socialist Society" is a standing assertion that Socialism is a necessary outcome of a sincere acceptance of Christian principles.

In some localities, notably in parts of Scotland and the west of England, the greater part of the movement is religious in tone.

The Socialist influence in the churches is not confined to any one denomination. The established Episcopalian Church, strongly conservative in general bias, contains a large number of outspoken Socialist clergymen, especially among the younger "High Church" party.

The "Guild of St. Matthew," a widespread sacramental organization, with several hundred clerical and lay members, has become an essentially Socialistic body, and its founder and head, the Rev. Stewart D. Headlam, is a prominent worker in the Socialist cause, and was elected as such to the London School Board at the recent election. The monthly newspaper, "The Church Reformer," which is the organ of Mr. Headlam and the Guild, is a frankly Socialist medium of great ability. The "Christian Social Union" was formed in October 1889, under the auspices of Canon Scott Holland, to carry on a similar work.

Socialism now forms a regular subject of discussion at diocesan conferences and at the annual "Church Congress," and it was a pro

minent item at the Pan-Anglican Conference of Bishops in 1888. In no case has it met with general condemnation, the tone being usually one of inconsistent and timid approval. The bishops, indeed, paid it the tribute of a special committee, whose well-intentioned but ill-informed report contained the following exhortation :

"No more important problems can well occupy the attention—whether of clergy or laity—than such as are connected with what is popularly called Socialism. To study schemes proposed for redressing the social balance, to welcome the good which may be found in the aims or operations of any, and to devise methods, whether by legislation or by social combinations or in any other way, for a peaceful solution of the problems without violence or injustice, is one of the noblest pursuits which can engage the thoughts of those who strive to follow in the footsteps of Christ." [1]

The memorial of the Guild of St. Matthew to this Pan-Anglican Conference, which drew forth the above Episcopal blessing, is perhaps the best exposition extant of the feeling of the Socialist members of the Established Church. After referring to the hideous revelations of the recent Royal Commission on the Housing of

[1] Report of Pan-Anglican Conference (London, 1888. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge).

the Poor, and the increasing instability of the commercial system, the Memorial proceeds to declare the growing conviction that—

"Our present social system—if the words 'social system' can be used of that which is largely the outcome of anarchic competition—is cruel and dishonest, and needs drastic reform and radical reorganisation. The startling contrast between the hovels of the poor and the houses of the rich within the same city, between the pitiful wage of the labourer and the vast income of the idler, between the poverty of the tenant and the luxury of the landlord, especially in our large towns, has been put before English society with startling vividness. A wave of Socialist thought has swept over England. The older party divisions are becoming less and less distinct. Socialism seems destined to produce in the near future a perfectly new moral 'line of cleavage' in English society.

"Herein, we respectfully submit to your Grace, are great moral questions with which it is the plain duty of the Church to deal. It has long been conceded by many Churchmen that the housing and feeding of 'Christ's poor' are pre-eminently matters with which the followers of Him who fed the hungry and healed the sick should concern themselves. Under the 'Housing' question lies the Land question, as surely as the house stands on the land. Mr. George denounces our present land system as one that robs the many for the benefit of the few. His opponents retort with a charge of 'plunder,' and describe the movement for restoring to the people the value which they give to the land as one of 'robbery plus cant.' Shall the Church of Christ be dumb when men turn to her for guidance in this matter? Her priests, in the name of God, from the altars

of His Church, proclaim 'Thou shalt not steal.' What is it to steal?

"Again, the Socialist objects to the competitive commercial system under which we live that it 'robs the poor because he is poor;' that it enables and encourages the capitalist to 'build his house by unrighteousness and his chambers by wrong,' inasmuch as it gives him the power, by taking advantage of the competition for a mere livelihood, to 'use (a large part of) his neighbour's service without wages, and give him nought for his work.' The differences between political party programmes sink into insignificance beside the moral question here involved. Churchmen are beginning to ask, 'Is it *true* that the landlord and capitalist are able, independently of any work done by themselves. to appropriate a large share of the results of the labour of their unprivileged brethren? If it be true that this is so, is it *just?*"

The Memorial then proceeds to insist on two Christian principles, viz.:

"First, *Every man should work.* There should be no idle class; no class of those who consume but do not produce; no privileged body allowed to live upon the produce of others' labour without rendering a due equivalent.

"Secondly, *The produce of labour must be distributed on a much more equitable system than at present.* The landlord and the capitalist, say the Socialists, secure by far too great a share of the wealth created by labour. They take the first and often the largest share with an acknowledged tendency to increase their takings till no more than a bare subsistence is left to the labourer. The Socialist claim may not be orthodox economy from the stand-point of *laissez faire*, but it sounds strangely like an echo of St.

Paul's dictum, 'The husbandman that laboureth must be the *first* to partake of the fruits.' 'He that plougheth ought to plough in *hope*, and he that thresheth to thresh in hope of partaking.' And yet it has needed almost a revolution within the last generation to bring 'hope' within the life of the English husbandman.'"

This remarkable declaration of Christian politics concludes as follows:

"Your memorialists respectfully submit, therefore, that with the main contentions of the Socialist, the Christian is not only able but bound to agree. With the moral questions herein involved, the theologian is bound to concern himself. The suggestion of practical remedies belongs rather to the province of the politician. All suggested remedies must, of course, be tested by the Christian standard of right and wrong, and no so-called reform which robs a man of that which is rightfully his own, can be sanctioned. But the question of the moral basis of property, 'What is rightfully a man's own?' has to be boldly faced and answered."

Few of the Bishops, it need hardly be said, ever venture to tackle the question so strongly urged upon them, but they do not now dare to condemn it. The great majority of the beneficed clergy, especially in the rural districts, scarcely yet realise that Socialism is anything more than the "red spectre" dreaded of continental bourgeoisie, but those who look out into the world are slowly becoming conscious

that it is not without its import for Anglicanism. The Established Church is, indeed, obviously a Socialist institution in form, and adherents of the "Establishment" are beginning to see that Socialist influence is rather tending to weaken the prevailing Radical inclination to separate Church and State, than to incense the masses against theology. The prevailing evil of the English Church is the aristocratic taint of the majority of its beneficed clergy. As Ruskin put it, they dine with the rich, and preach to the poor. Until they are more willing to dine with the poor, and preach to the rich, its popular influence will be limited. Signs are not wanting that its more earnest leaders are now beginning to perceive this.

In other denominations the Socialist leaven is strong among the younger ministers, and even the leaders are now frequently Socialistic in tone and spirit. Among the Wesleyans, Rev. Hugh Price Hughes and Rev. Mark Guy Pearse have made various outspoken declarations on the subject, and the "religious weeklies" devote a large and increasing space to the "labour problem" and the evil effects of "landlordism."

Among other Christian ministers of various denominations who are either avowed Socialists, or who have written approvingly on Socialism, may be cited the following: Rev. Canon Westcott, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge; Canon Vaughan; Canon Scott Holland; Prebendary Eyton; Rev. Wilfrid Richmond, late Warden of Glenalmond School; Rev. John Oakley, D.D., Dean of Manchester; Rev. S. A. Barnett ("Practicable Socialism"); Rev. H. C. Shuttleworth, Rev. T. Hancock ("The Banner of Christ in the hands of the Socialists"); Rev. E. D. Girdlestone ("Society Classified," "Christian Socialism vs. Present Day Unsocialism"); Rev. P. H. Wicksteed ("Christianity and Personal Life," etc., also author of a remarkable "Alphabet of Political Economy," etc.); Rev. John Glasse, Rev. T. Travers Sherlock, Rev. C. E. Brooke, Rev. A. W. Jephson, M.L.S.B., and many others.

A very remarkable article by the Dean of Wells (E. A. Plumptre), in the *Contemporary Review* for Nov. 1889, sets forth, under the title of "Christianity and Socialism," a frankly sympathetic account of the relations between

these two forces, as they appear to a high dignitary of the Church.

The Roman Catholic Creed is so largely the faith of the pious poor in the most poverty stricken districts of London and the Lancashire towns that its priests could not escape the prevailing Socialist influence. They are moreover frequently of Irish race, and are necessarily much interested in the Irish attack on "landlordism." It is therefore not surprising to find that, notwithstanding Papal denunciations of Continental "Socialism," a considerable number of the younger priests in urban centres, especially in London, are very Socialistic in tone and sympathy. The well-known keen interest of Cardinal Manning for social reforms, and his ultra democratic Christianity, stimulate this tendency, and it is beginning to be mentioned that the Fathers furnish excellent argument against private property, an institution which the Church tolerates, but of which it has never approved. The rehousing of the poor by public authorities is now set forth as an obvious Christian duty, and a small "Catholic Guild for the Furtherance of Social Reform" has been started to pursue the matter.

It is indeed beginning to be suspected by not a few earnest Christians that the future of Christianity in England is very largely bound up with Socialism and Democracy. Unless Christianity can once more become the accepted faith of the masses, its influence must inevitably undergo a serious popular decline, and it is already certain that the masses will accept no anti-socialist faith. The churches are accordingly turning timidly towards the rising sun, and the eager reception, by evangelical Christian reformers, of Mr. Henry George as a notable champion of the faith, is significant of the change of tone. English Protestantism, in short, is gradually discarding its individualistic quietism and "other worldliness," and is coming more and more forward as an active political influence towards the creation of "the Kingdom of God on earth."

But however well disposed they may be to social reforms, the great bulk of the ministers of religion of all denominations are, it need hardly be said, still attached strongly to the existing industrial order, and for want of economic knowledge, are usually unable to imagine any other, even as an ideal. The rural

clergy, moreover, are usually hopelessly Conservative in politics. Those who believe that Christian principles involve the acceptance of Socialism are still in an insignificant minority, but their influence is already apparent and is an obviously growing one. How the "social question" appeals to the "Free Churches" may be judged from the remarkable paper read by Mr. Albert Spicer, J.P. (Liberal candidate for Monmouth borough) at the Congregational Union Meeting at Hull in October, 1889. This paper has been published under the title of "Christian Economics with reference to the Land Question." (London: Unwin Brothers, 71a Ludgate Hill, price one penny.)

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

CHAPTER V.

SOCIALISM AT THE UNIVERSITIES.

OXFORD and Cambridge have long ceased to occupy the position of leaders of advanced thought in any department of study, and in biology and sociology in particular they have followed, rather than led, their generation. But as the places of education of a large though diminishing majority of the "classe dirigeante," their influences have an immense ultimate effect upon social administration. It is, therefore, not without significance that considerable attention should just now be paid to Socialism at both of these ancient seats of learning. At each of them several Fellows and Tutors of Colleges avow themselves Socialists, and are members of one or the other of the Socialist organizations. The teaching of history and economics is much influenced by social tendencies. The subject of Socialism is frequently discussed in one aspect or another, at College debating societies, and

Socialist resolutions at the "Union" occasionally even command a majority of votes. Socialist lectures have lately been given in several Colleges by permission of the authorities, this part of the propaganda being chiefly performed by the Fabian Society, which has a standing "Universities Committee." The Guild of St. Matthew, a strongly Socialistic organization (see page 64), has a permanent branch composed of Oxford undergraduates, which is, however, now likely to be merged in a branch of the "Christian Social Union," (see page 64).

At Oxford the influence of T. H. Green and Arnold Toynbee[1] has formed the centre round which has grown up a distinctly Socialist mode of thought, the influence of which is at present hardly checked by any formulated resistance. The "Toynbee Hall Settlement" in Whitechapel, itself a marked example of the recent growth of "social compunction," is a nucleus of real, though somewhat sentimental and un-

[1] See his *Industrial Revolution*, notably the lecture entitled "Are Radicals Socialists?" A sympathetic account of Toynbee's life and work is given as Part I. in the Seventh Series of Johns Hopkins' University Studies in Historical and Political Science, by Mr. F. C. Montague, M.A., Oxford, author of *The Limits of Individual Liberty.*

practical Socialism, fed by a constant stream of University graduates, who are themselves mostly Socialists of one type or another. The main defect of this movement is the absence of really democratic management, and the inevitable prevalence of a tone of patronage and philanthropy.

Cambridge is, perhaps, less Socialistic than Oxford, though more economic. More than one of its Professors confess, however, to belief in the ultimate triumph of Socialist principles, and the younger generation of economic students is largely Socialistic in spirit. Several of the "Extension lecturers" supplied to the larger provincial towns are Socialists, and there is every sign of the movement growing. King's College, indeed, lent its lecture-room in the Lent Term, 1889, for delivery of a series of seven lectures on the Basis and Idea of Socialism, by members of the Fabian Society, well known as Socialist lecturers. These lectures have been published as "Fabian Essays in Socialism," (see page 38).

Among recent notable publications from the Universities may be instanced Professor Karl

Pearson's (of King's College, Cambridge, and University College, London); "The Ethic of Freethought," a collection of Socialist Essays (London, 1888: Fisher Unwin); "Darwinism and Politics," by D. G. Ritchie, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College, Oxford (London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1889); "The Moral Function of the State" (same author, to be obtained from the Guild of St. Matthew, 8 Duke Street, Adelphi, London), and a translation of Schäffle's "Quintessence of Socialism," by Bernard Bosanquet, M.A., late Fellow of University College, Oxford (London, Swan, Sonnenschein & Co.).

It is, however, easy to exaggerate the extent to which a vague Socialism has unconsciously obtained a hold upon the two older Universities. It must not be forgotten that seven out of ten of the younger members of both Universities are in the stage of belonging merely to the unthinking "Junkerthum," which, in such an inquiry, counts for no more than the "pigs and Philisters" whom Heine excluded from the population of Gottingen. The great bulk of the intellectual life, moreover, is still cynically critical and suspicious of Democracy, and the Uni-

versity influence makes, on the whole, for Conservatism. A Socialist movement, none the less potent because largely unconscious of itself, is, however, obviously at work.

It cannot be said that the English Universities have as yet had any influence on the Socialist movement itself. Unlike the "Katheder Socialisten" of Germany, they have been affected by it, but have not themselves affected it. The radical vice of University life—the divorce of thought from action—has tended to deprive many resident University men, of all capacity for real political work in national matters, whilst their social and municipal surroundings, far removed from the pressing industrial problems of the great cities, tend to hypnotize their minds and to lull even the most advanced of them to a placid acquiescence in, or merely spasmodic protest against, the *status quo*. This timidity has especially affected the University economists, and though these are largely Socialist in opinion and in conversation, their published works still retain, in form as well as in matter, a strong impress of the crude Individualism which they unanimously profess to repudiate. A great change in this respect is,

however, visible among the younger Fellows, who are shaking off the corrupting influence of the old style.

The University influence, hesitating and unpractical as it is, is, nevertheless, exercising a potent effect upon the current opinion of the English cultivated classes. A wide divergence of thought is here apparent between England and the United States. In England the old *a priori* Individualism is universally abandoned. No Professor ever founds any argument, whether in defence of the rights of property or otherwise, upon the inherent right of the individual to his own physical freedom and to the possession of such raw material as he has made his own by expending personal effort upon. "The first step must be to rid our minds of the idea that there are any such things in social matters as abstract rights" ("The State in Relation to Labour," ch. 1, p. 6, by the late W. Stanley Jevons, Professor of Political Economy at University College, London). The whole case on both sides is now made to turn exclusively on the balance of social advantage, and practically no Individualist *axiomata media* are allowed to be taken for granted. The older Individualist

arguments are to be found now only in the "Liberty and Property Defence League,"[1] which has no philosophic importance, or in the writings of Mr. Herbert Spencer[2] and Mr. Auberon Herbert. It would be safe to say that the political influence of these latter gentlemen is absolutely imperceptible.

[1] The almost exclusively Conservative organization of landlords and capitalists which has been formed to resist the prevailing democratic "attacks" upon the "rights of property."

[2] It must not be overlooked, moreover, that Mr. Herbert Spencer bases the whole of his ideal Individualism upon what he considers the indispensable basis of complete Land Nationalization. (See *Social Statics*, passim). The editor of the *Personal Rights Journal*, the only distinctively Individualist organ, agrees in this view. Such "Individualists" as these find themselves in constant opposition to the defenders of "private property" as property, as Mr. Spencer discovered on the occasion of his correspondence in the *Times*, October 1889. The effect of his declarations on that occasion is that, whilst still maintaining the thesis that individual land ownership is absolutely wrong, he deprecates the confiscation of the property of innocent owners, and regards it impossible for any State Government to manage land. His objections do not, however, appear to apply to the generally proposed method of land nationalization, viz, the gradual increase of local and national taxation of rent.

CHAPTER VI.

SOCIALISM IN POLITICAL ECONOMY.

In no department of thought has the change been more apparent during the present generation than in the accepted tenets and general tone of Political Economy. For the first two generations of its history the Smith-Ricardo economics made, on the whole, for Individualism. The prevailing reaction against the monarchic and obligarchic bureaucracies led the earlier economists of this century to lean towards *Laissez Faire*, and this tendency was accentuated by their essentially atomistic conception of society, and the shallow optimism which they had caught from Rousseau. The industrial revolution, which was all the time proceeding, had however the incidental effect of rendering obsolete most of their practical deductions, almost before they were formulated, and the obviously destructive effects of complete individual freedom of use of the means of produc-

tion, compelled the statesman and the "practical man" to disregard the economist's mistaken warnings. Beginning in 1802, Factory Act after Factory Act was passed in the teeth of stubborn economic resistance, and the legislation of England for the last generation has been one long record of limitations on private property for the public good.[1]

Meanwhile a new conception of the State had arisen. From Comte, Darwin and Spencer the idea of the social Organism was gradually filtering into men's minds, and unconsciously altering all their political theories and ideals. It has gradually become recognized that a Perfect City was something different from any number of good citizens, something to be tried by other tests and weighed in other balances. The lesson of Evolution, at first thought to be the apotheosis of anarchic individual competition, is now recognized to be quite the contrary. We have to learn, Professor Huxley tells us,[2] to substitute consciously adapted co-ordination

1. See Mr. Herbert Spencer's animated but isolated protest, *Man vs. The State.*

2. *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1888. See also Ritchie's *Darwinism and Politics*, already referred to.

for internecine competition, if the Organism which will prove to be the "Fittest to Survive," is to be also the best. Even the Political Economists are learning this lesson, and the fundamental idea of a Social Organism paramount over and prior to the individual of each generation, is penetrating to their minds and appearing in their lectures, though it has not even yet affected to any great extent their more elaborate treatises.

The progress towards Socialism has, however, been strikingly apparent even in economic literature. The publication of J. S. Mill's "Political Economy," in 1848, conveniently marks the boundary between the old and the new economics. Every edition of Mill's book became more and more Socialistic in tone, until his death revealed to the world in the "Autobiography" (p. 231-2) his emphatic and explicit repudiation of mere political democracy in favour of complete Socialism. Since then the progress has been rapid. By the definite rejection of the Wages Fund Theory, the development and extension of the Ricardian Law of Rent,[1] and

[1] See numerous suggestions on this point throughout Mr. Sidgwick's *Principles of Political Economy*, and the article

the gradual modification and subordination of "Malthusianism," the scientific difference between the "orthodox" economists and the economic Socialists has now become mainly one of terminology and relative stress, with the result that one competent economist,[1] not himself a Socialist, publishes regretfully to the world that all the younger men are now Socialists, with many of the Professors.

Professor Henry Sidgwick (Professor of Moral Philosophy, Cambridge), the most cautious of men, even publishes an article with a view to correct the world's mistaken impression that Political Economy is opposed to Socialism, and shows that, on the contrary, the Socialist proposals are a plain and obvious deduction from accepted economic principles.[2]

This convergence has been facilitated by the fact that English Socialists are by no means

by the present writer, "The Rate of Interest and the Laws of Distribution" (*Quarterly Journal of Economics*, January, 1888).

[1] Rev. F. W. Avelling, M.A., Principal of the Independent College, Taunton, in leaflet of August, 1888, *Down with the Socialists.*

[2] "Economic Socialism" in *Contemporary Review*, November, 1886.

blind worshippers of Karl Marx. Whilst recognizing his valuable services to economic history, and as a stirrer of men's minds, a large number of English Socialist economists reject his special contributions to pure economics. His theory of value meets with little support in English economic circles, where that of Jevons is becoming increasingly dominant. Although the leaders of the two largest Socialist organizations have been strongly influenced by Marx, the rank and file of the Socialist party do not found their Socialism on any special economic theories, but upon the patent results of individual ownership, as shown in the large payments for rent and interest. The great bulk of the unconscious Socialism of the English voter and statesman has been based merely upon empirical observation, and has certainly not been affected by any notion of "surplus value." The economic influence most potent among the Socialist Radicals is still that of John Stuart Mill.

Recent economic publications betray the dominant collectivist influence even where this is not intended. The latest popular handbook of "orthodox" Political Economy, published by

one of the universities, is written by a College lecturer who declares himself a Communist, and another recent manual, "for the use of schools," is the production of a college professor of economics, who is an energetic public advocate of complete Land Nationalization.

It was computed in December, 1887, that out of a total of fourteen courses of lectures on economics being delivered under the auspices of various public bodies in London, eight, and possibly more, were being given by professed Socialists. One of the "University Extension" societies lately found some difficulty in obtaining young economist lecturers sufficiently free from what some of its older members thought the Socialistic taint. If it were not for the friendly services of such persons as Mr Auberon Herbert (who serve the purpose of the stakes at the side of the glacier by which we note its motion), it would indeed be difficult to measure a progress which is so general.

When the editors of the Encyclopædia Britannica needed for their ninth edition an article setting forth the development and position of political economy, it was toa Socialistic Positivist that they addressed themselves, and

the article took the form of a lengthy survey of the steady convergence of all the tendencies towards a Socialist state.

"We have been suffering for a century," says one "orthodox" Professor, "from an acute outbreak of individualism, unchecked by the old restraints, and invested with almost a religious sanction by a certain soulless school of writers."[1] Economists fully recognise that this industrial anarchy cannot last. The ordinary middle-class citizen still believes that "free competition" and individual liberty represent the perfection of social order, but the economic philosopher sees this régime melting away before his eyes. It is significant that both Mr. Spencer and Mr. Auberon Herbert, practically the only two surviving philosophic adherents of complete *Laissez Faire*, betray in their writings that they are not political economists,[2] and it is a matter of common ex-

[1] H. S. Foxwell, M.A. (St. John's College, Cambridge, Professor of Political Economy at University College, London) p. 249 of essay in *The Claims of labour* (Edinburgh, 1886, Co-operative Printing Company).

[2] In 1884 Mr. Spencer was still basing his arguments on the old "Wages Fund" theory (see. for instance, *Man versus the State*, page 23).

perience that a course of lessons in the "law of rent" will usually convert a mere Radical into something very like a Socialist. And this interest in political economy is increasing. The first edition of the English translation of Marx's "Capital" (by Dr. E. B. and Eleanor Marx Aveling) was soon exhausted, and more popular writings on economics now find a ready sale. Works like Gronlund's "Co-operative Commonwealth" (Modern Press: 1s.), and Bellamy's "Looking Backward" (Reeves: 1s., of this, over 40,000 have been sold in England, and 210,000 in America), are exercising a potent influence on public ideals, and are but premature popularisations of the current economic views as to the future of society.

"It is indeed certain," sums up Dr. Ingram, "that industrial society will not permanently remain without a systematic organization. The mere conflict of private interests will never produce a well-ordered commonwealth of labour."[1]

[1] Article *Political Economy* in Encyclopædia Britannica, Vol. XIX. 1886, p. 382, by J. K. Ingram, LL.D., Librarian and late Professor at Trinity College, Dublin. The article has since been published, with revisions, as a *History of Political Economy*.

English economists formerly looked for escape from the present evil state of individualist chaos to the progress of voluntary co-operation. John Stuart Mill[1] seemed to hope that, in some unexplained way, the growth of this movement would induce the present owners of land and the other indispensable means of wealth production voluntarily to cede to the public the unearned incomes which this ownership secures to them. This optimistic vagueness was perhaps merely one of the devices sometimes adopted by Mill to avoid a premature expression of actual political schemes. No one professes any belief to-day in this chimera. Even so lately as 1874, it was possible for Professor Cairnes to think that help might be found (at any rate, by the better paid labourers) by means of co-operation in production, and in no other way. He then wrote, in words pregnant with import to the social reformer: "If workmen do not rise from dependence upon capital by the path of co-operation, then they must remain in dependence upon capital; the margin for the possible improvement of their lot is confined within narrow barriers which cannot

[1] See Book IV. of the *Political Economy*.

be passed, and the problem of their elevation is hopeless. As a body, they will not rise at all. A few more energetic or more fortunate than the rest will, from time to time, escape, as they do now, from the ranks of their fellows to the higher walks of industrial life, but the great majority will remain substantially where they are. The remuneration of labour, as such, skilled or unskilled, can never rise much above its present level." (J. E. Cairnes, Emeritus Professor of Political Economy at University College, London, "Some Leading Principles of Political Economy,' page 348, 1874).

Fifteen years have passed away since these words were written, and it must now be apparent, even to the most sanguine of individualists, that the chance of the great bulk of the labourers ever rising by associations for co-operative production has become even less hopeful than it ever was, and Dr. J. K. Ingram has to tell us that modern economists, such as T. E. Cliffe Leslie, (late Professor of Political Economy at Queen's University, Ireland), and President F. A. Walker, regard the idea as "chimerical" (Article on "Political Economy," in Encyclopædia Britannica, Vol. XIX.

p. 382). Even so friendly an economist as Mr. Leonard Courtney[1] agrees in this view. Yet this, according to authorities so eminent, is the only hope for the labourer under the present arrangements of society, or any modification of them resting on the private ownership of the means of production.

Co-operation would be a seductive means of escape, as enabling the poor to become richer without making the rich poorer, and most social reformers cannot, even now, refrain from keeping alive lingering hopes that some means of performing the impossible may here be found. But a whole generation of experiment has done little more than show the futility of expecting real help from this quarter. Less than one four hundredth part of the industry of the country is yet carried on by co-operation. The whole range of industrial development seems against it, and no ground for hope in co-operation as an answer to the social problem can be gained from economic history. It does not so much as attempt to deal with economic rent, or

[1] Speech at Toynbee Hall, 24th January, 1887, p. 34, of *Co-operation vs. Socialism* (Manchester, Central Co-operative Board).

with such public services as railways, gasworks or schools. It affords a valuable moral training, a profitable but somewhat hazardous savings bank for small investments, and a temporary means of interesting the worker in the industrial affairs of his country. But it is merely a survival from the days before Limited Companies and Savings Banks existed, and ordinary joint stock investment is now rapidly elbowing it out of the field at an ever increasing rate, and, measured by the capital employed, is already a hundred and sixty times as great as co-operation. Even the most enthusiastic believer in the virtues of association will hardly expect salvation merely from a régime of Joint Stock Companies, and this, and not co-operation, is clearly the line in which our industrial development is rapidly travelling. It will, of course, be some time before the more enthusiastic co-operators realise it, or even become aware that modern economic science turns regretfully against their panacea for all industrial difficulties, but the rank and file are rapidly learning the lesson, and are gradually turning towards those principles of Socialism, out of which the present co-operative movement

sprang.[1] Its more democratic leaders have never ceased to hold them and to regret the general neglect of citizenship for mere huckstering and scramble for dividends, into which so much of the noble co-operative ideal has sunk.

But even a universal extension of voluntary co-operation, productive or distributive, would not obviate the tribute of labour to ownership, which private property in land and all its modifications necessarily involves.[2] Co-operation aims at abolishing, not economic rent, but industrial competition, and it has positively no vision of anything beyond ownership by co-operative groups, the workers paying a fixed instead of an uncertain interest on all their land and other "capital." This might improve the relations between the capitalist and the labourer, and even put an end to competition between traders, but it prefigures no abolition of the tribute from labour to ownership, and few English economists would now be inclined to dispute with John Stuart Mill that, "as Feugueray

[1] Holyoakes' *History of Co-operation* (London, 1875, Trübner) Vol. I, passim.

[2] Pointed out in an article on the *Economic Limitations of Co-operation* by the present writer, in the *Co-operative News*, January 12, 1889.

well says, 'the deepest root of the evils and iniquities which fill the industrial world is not competition, but the subjection of labour to capital *and the enormous share which the possessors of the instruments of industry are able to take from the produce.*'" [1]

It is essentially this "enormous share" of rent and interest; now amounting in the United Kingdom to over one-third of the produce,[2] to which Socialists object, and not, as is generally supposed, to the high "rent of ability" earned by managers and other workers of scarce personal attainments. Much, of course, of the so-called "profits" of modern capitalist industry are now seen to be merely the fruits of speculation and of the unnecessary multiplication of dealers and distributors. Much of the so-called "rent of ability" is due merely to the advantages of social position and the possession of an expensive education. Genuine "rent of ability" the scarce worker will always be able to obtain under any social system, if he insists upon it, but English economists would now us-

[1] J. S. Mill *Political Economy*, People's Edition, p. 477.

[2] See the evidence of Mr. Giffen and other statisticians in *Facts for Socialists.* (Fabian Tract, No. 5.)

ually agree that the rent and interest could conceivably be gradually diverted from individuals to the public exchequer by appropriate legislative enactments, without dislocation of industry or depriving any contemporary worker of the product of his toil.

The recent development of companies, rings and trusts merely accentuates the industrial situation and prepares the way for further public control. All the salt mines in England are practically managed by one small board of directors, who are thus enabled to work each mine up to its economic "margin of cultivation" without hindrance from conflicting personal interests. Competition is now admitted to fail as a regulator of private greed and to give way before ordered industrial association.[1] It is already clear that the democracy will not allow this "monarchizing" of industry to pass beyond its control, and consequently the further progress of factory legislation, of municipal and national industrial administration, and the increasing absorption of rent and interest by taxation now

[1] See Professor Foxwell's paper on this subject at the British Association Bath Meeting (September, 1888), Economic Section.

receive the hesitating support,[1] instead of encountering the determined resistance, of the economic Professors and their students. The well-worn platitudes about the universal paramountcy of "self-help," and the almost divine honours paid to "the law of supply and demand," appear now only in the leading articles of Conservative newspapers or the speeches of politicians or Bishops—that is to say, in nearly all the directions which assume to guide our public action. The English economist himself knows them no more, and (if he is of democratic sympathies) finds himself, to his surprise, differing from the reasonable Socialist agitator only in matters of detail and terminology, or as to the desirable rate of progress and the relative emphasis on various points. The usual distinction is one of individual temperament, accompanied by a very general ignorance of each other's real position. Neither in economic theory nor in political application is there any longer a real divergence of principle between them.

It must, however, be observed that those

[1] See *The State in Relation to Labour*, by the late W. Stanley Jevons, Professor of Political Economy at University College, London (1882.)

"chaplains of the middle class," the University Professors of Political Economy, are not usually either Democratic in their sympathies or explicit in their political utterances, so that their influence in correcting the ignorant fallacies which still pass current for Political Economy among the mass of "respectable" citizens, is not great. The obsolete crudities of "Manchesterism" will, therefore, probably continue to invest the senate, the exchange and the editor's office for a considerable time to come, although they have long since been swept out of the economist's study.

CHAPTER VII.

Parliamentary and Municipal Socialism.

It is difficult to assign a beginning to English Socialist legislation, even in the modern sense of the term. Before the Mediaeval conception of the State has passed away, the Elizabethan Poor Laws, culminating in the great Act of 1601, definitely asserted the right of the very poorest to participate in the results of the national industry. During the next two centuries Socialistic legislation was almost confined to this form of collectivist philanthropy, while the commercial development of the country was preparing the way for the great industrial revolution and the triumph of private capitalism. At the beginning of the present century the zenith of industrial individualism seems to have been reached. Political tyranny was at its height, but the fullest liberty was left to the owner of land and capital, so far, at least, as all the new industries were concerned, to use them for his utmost personal advantage,

however many lives of men, wo[illegible] children were destroyed in the process. [illegible] results upon the national life were so appa[illegible] that practical statesmen were compelled [illegible] intervene. The first Factory Act was passed in 1802,[1] and others followed in 1819 (59 Geo.

[1] 42 Geo. III., c. 73, See *English Factory Legislation* by E. von Plener (London 1873, Chapman and Hall,) which contains an instructive introduction by Mr. Mundella, M.P., whose industrial experience renders him specially qualified to give an opinion as to the results of Factory legislation, and the limitation by law of the hours of adult labour. He expresses his complete agreement with the Duke of Argyle ("Reign of Law," ch. vii.) that "progress in Political Science has been in nothing happier than in Factory Legislation." Nor is his testimony less emphatic as regards what the late Professor Newmarch called the "wholly successful" limitation of the hours of labour by law. Nowhere has this limitation been longer and more thoroughly applied than among the textile operatives in Lancashire and Yorkshire. In their case the limit of 56½ hours per week virtually applies to adult men as well as to adult women. Mr. Mundella can bear the following decisive testimony as to the results of this legislation. "An argument which is freely advanced against the interference of the State with the relations of capital and labour is that it tends to undermine the independence and self-reliance of the class which it seeks to protect, and teaches them to look to the State rather than to their own exertions to remedy evils requiring redress. My answer to this is that the factory operatives of Lancashire and Yorkshire have made greater

), 1825 (6 Geo. IV. c. 63), and 1831 (1 Wm. IV. c. 39). It was however left for gradually developing humanitarian influence, d by Tory and aristocratic members, such as Mr. M. T. Sadler and Lord Shaftesbury, to make these limitations upon private property really effective, in the teeth of the most embittered opposition from the contemporary Liberals and political economists.

Since that day the progress has been rapid. Every decade has seen a notable stride taken towards genuine popular government, and every such advance has been used by the people to procure the passage of futher Socialist legislation.

The Reform Bill of 1832, mere middle-class enfranchisement as it was, resulted in 1833 (3 and 4 Wm. IV. c. 103) in the first really effective Factory Act, and enabled Lord Ashley (afterwards Lord Shaftesbury) to carry his Acts of 1842, 1844 and 1847, each imposing fresh

advances in self-reliance and independence during the past fifty years than any other class of English operatives. Building and Benefit Societies, Co-operative Associations, both for distribution and production, have taken their rise and flourish amongst them on a scale of magnitude unknown in any other part of the United Kingdom." See "The Limitation of the Hours of Labour," *Contemporary Review*, Dec., 1889.

restrictions on private ownership of the means of production. The same reforming impulse gave us the Mining Act of 1842 (5 and 6 Vic. c. 99) and by the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835 created several hundred energetic centres of local Socialistic development. The same period saw the beginning of sanitary legislation, by which a further series of limitations were imposed on land and capital owners for the common weal. During the first 45 years of the century nearly 400 "Local Improvement Acts" were passed, conferring sanitary powers upon more than 200 local authorities.[1]

In 1847 and 1848, these scattered legislative powers were gathered up into important codes, finally consolidated in the "Public Health Act" of 1875. This legislation is wholly Socialist in character. Innumerable restrictions upon the free use of private property are imposed, and the rights of ownership are thereby, in the public interest, considerably curtailed. The value of the inferior kinds of house property is frequently much diminished by the enforcement of these provisions. The community, by its local political organisations, has

[1] Clifford, *History of Private Bill Legislation*, Vol. II., p. 300.

28404

assumed the collective administration of innumerable social services and levies, mainly to the advantage of the poorer classes, a series of "rates," or assessments upon real property, which now absorb a large percentage of its annual rental. This class of Socialist legislation is constantly increasing.

It is not only in matters of sanitation that this "Municipal Socialism" is progressing. Nearly half the gas consumers of the Kingdom already consume gas made by themselves as citizens collectively, in 168 different localities,[1] as many as 14 local authorities obtained power to borrow money to engage in the gas industry in a single year.[2] Water supply is rapidly coming to be universally a matter of public provision, no fewer than 71 separate governing bodies obtaining loans for this purpose in the year 1885-6 alone.[3] The prevailing tendency is for the municipalities to absorb also the tramway industry, 31 localities already owning their own lines, comprising a quarter of the total mileage in the Kingdom.[4]

[1] Board of Trade Return, 1889.
[2] Report of Local Government Board for 1886-7, C-5526.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] House of Commons Return, H. C. 347, 1888.

Most of these authorities lease their lines, but one does not shrink from this public organization of labour and successfully administers its own property. The example thus set by Huddersfield, will probably be followed shortly by Liverpool and the Metropolis. The concessions of the London Tramway Companies expire in a few years, and there is already a strong feeling in favour of the lines being worked directly by the County Council as the only practicable means of securing shorter hours and proper treatment for the employés. The present Chairman of the County Council (Lord Rosebery) has publicly declared himself in favour of this course.

Besides the numerous acts regulating factories and worshops, and similar legislation dealing with mines, printworks, fishcuring establishments, bakehouses, alkali works, and many other industries, there are now extensive codes regulating merchant shipping, and seamen, gasworks, railways, tramways, theatres, public houses, and, in fact, nearly every large trade.

Nor is there any sign of a slackening in this progress. The "Shop Hours Regulation

Act" of 1886 limited the hours during which any shop employing "young persons" may be kept open; and it is already apparent that a formidable agitation will soon compel the explicit restriction of the working day for adults. The Political Economists will offer no opposition as to principle. "I see nothing," said Professor Jevons already in 1882, referring to the proposal for an "Eight Hours Bill," "to forbid the State interfering in the matter if it could be clearly shown that the existing customs are injurious to health, and that there is no other probable remedy. Neither principle, experience nor precedent in other cases of legislation, prevents us from contemplating the idea of State interference in such circumstances."[1]

The "Extension of the Factory Acts" is already a plank in the Liberal platform. "Unfettered individual competition," says Mr. John Morley, "is not a principle to which the regulation of industry may be entrusted."[2] Mr. Morley, indeed, still resists the reduction of the hours of labour prescribed by law, from ten

[1] *The State in Relation to Labour*, ch. 3, p. 65.

[2] "*Life of Cobden*," Vol. I. ch. xiii. p. 298, 303.

to eight, and the general extension to all industries of the legal limitation of the working day which has been found (to use Professor Newmarch's words) so "wholly successful" in Lancashire. Other members, however, are not so firm, and Liberal candidates are pledging themselves in all directions, to support some such "Eight Hours Bill" as that drafted by the Fabian Society.[1]

Public education would not appear a Socialist measure in the United States, where the ample resources of the reserved public lands prevent its essentially collectivist character from being recognized. In England, however, the rapid progress towards free government schools is rightly cited as a marked instance of Socialist progress. The increasing absorption of the incomes of the comparatively rich, to provide for the education of their poorer brethren, makes its Socialist character disagreeably obtrusive to the capitalist as well as to the private school proprietor. No schoolmaster now looks forward to acquiring a school of his own, and the contemplation of a whole career passed as the

[1] Fabian Tract, No. 9, *An Eight Hours Bill in the form of an Amendment of the Factory Acts*, price 1d.

salaried officer of one public body or another does not seem either to check the zeal or to raise the salaries of persons entering the profession. This branch of industry has been virtually nationalized or municipalized without loss of stimulus or failure of enthusiasm. The movement towards the public provision of meals in the schools of poor districts is a still stronger testimony to the growth of the "collective" spirit. Many hundreds of thousands of gratuitous or cheap meals are already supplied to city children by organized charitable efforts with the co-operation of the school authorities. The London School Board has already decided to place these private collective agencies under public control and supervision. "One free meal a day," to be provided by the School Board itself, out of the rates upon property, was in the programme of not a few School Board candidates last year; and Mrs. Besant, the leading socialist advocate of this measure, was triumphantly returned at the head of the poll in East London. What is perhaps more surprising is that even the straitest sect of the economic Pharisees of the last generation are abandoning their opposition to it. Mr. John Morley

professes no objection, and is quite clear that some collective arrangements must immediately be made to provide the meals. If the voluntary aid now being organised and centralised by the London School Board proves insufficient to supply all the meals required, for every destitute child in London, Mr. Morley is prepared to make up the deficiency from the rates.[1]

The necessity of providing public work for the "unemployed," now a chronic winter feature of our great cities, is becoming daily more generally recognized. The government has already been forced to issue circulars to all local authorities urging them to set on foot extra works for the sake of offering employment at low wages to those demanding it. This is now done each winter, to a small extent, in many localities, and there is now a demand for the permanent public organization of the labour of all the recipients of Poor Law relief. The whole system of Poor Law relief will obviously be remodelled on Democratic lines. Plans suggested by the Rev. Herbert Mills and others, based on the Industrial Colonies of Holland and Germany, are likely to be tried, as it is now universally ad-

[1] Speech at Eighty Club, *Times*, November 20, 1889.

mitted that only by collectivist measures can the evils be dealt with.[1]

The "Housing of the Poor" in England's great cities is another problem already beginning to be solved on essentially Socialist lines. Over 1½ millions sterling have already been spent by London local authorities in subsidizing the building of cheap artisans' dwellings, and it is now strongly urged that the London County Council should take up the work with greatly increased energy. The Council has accordingly decided itself to provide artisans' dwellings on a site at Deptford, to be let at such rents as the local inhabitants can fairly afford. The city of Glasgow has, indeed, gone much further, the municipality (which already provides gas, water, markets, baths, washhouses, slaughterhouses, parks, botanic gardens, art galleries, museums, libraries, tramways, "houses of refuge," and industrial and other schools) having demolished vast areas of "slum" property, and itself built large blocks of dwellings for the poor, let at "moderate" rents. The municipality also

[1] See Mr. Charles Booth's "*Life and Labour in East London*" (Williams and Norgate).

maintains a number of "common lodging houses" with most successful results.[1]

This "Municipal Socialism" is being rapidly imitated by other local authorities with the effect of absorbing in "rates" a constantly increasing share of the rental of the country. Our progressive "municipalization of rent," by increase of local rates, is clearly only an unconscious form of gradual Land Nationalization. Many students, however, still have the idea that Socialism implies a rigidly centralized national administration of all the details of life. This is an entire misapprehension of the Socialist position. Such a society would be as abhorrent to Mr. William Morris as to Mr. Auberon Herbert. Socialists have, in fact, as yet contributed nothing to the difficult problem of political science as to the proper line of division between the functions of the central government and those of local authorities. All that can be said is, that, in England, Socialists and Individualists alike will more probably desire to make the regulation and taxation of private industry matters of centralization, whilst actual public

[1] Report of City of Glasgow Improvement Trust, 1888.

administration will probably be municipal. Factory Acts[1] and the Land Tax will be national, but gasworks and tramways local.

Subject to this distinction, hardly anyone now objects to the extension of local government activity. The innumerable multiplicity of services now performed by the local governing authorities makes it indeed impossible to record them all, and causes the English Government, in its various ramifications, to be by far the largest direct employer of labour in the country.

Besides our international relations and the army, navy, police and the courts of justice, the community now carries on for itself, in some part or another of these islands, the post-office, telegraphs, carriage of small commodities, coinage surveys, the regulation of the currency and note issue, the provision of weights and measures, the making, sweeping, lighting and repairing of the streets, roads and bridges, life insurance, the grant of annuities, ship-building, stock broking, banking, farming, and money lending. It provides for many thousands of us from birth to burial, midwifery, nursery, education, board and

[1] See the *experimentum crucis* recorded by Jevons (*The State in Relation to Labour*, ch. III., p. 59.)

lodging, vaccination, medical attendance, medicine, public worship, amusements and burial. It furnishes and maintains its own museums, parks, botanic gardens, art galleries, libraries, concert halls, roads, streets, bridges, markets, fire engines, light-houses, pilots, ferries, surf boats, steamtugs, life-boats, slaughter-houses, cemeteries, public baths, wash houses, pounds, harbours, piers, wharves, hospitals, dispensaries, gas works, water works, tramways, telegraph cables, allotments, cow meadows, artisans' dwellings, common lodging houses, schools, churches, and reading rooms. It carries on and publishes its own researches in geology, meteorology, statistics, zoölogy, geography, and even theology. In our colonies the English Government further allows and encourages the communities to provide for themselves railways, canals, pawnbroking, theatres, forestry, cinchona farms, irrigation, leper villages, casinos, bathing establishments, and immigration; and to deal in ballast, guano, quinine, opium, salt, and what not.[1] Every one of these functions, including even the army, navy, police and courts of justice, was at one time left to private enterprise, and

[1] See the *Colonial Office List* (London, annually, Harrison.)

was a source of legitimate individual investment of capital. Step by step the community has absorbed them, wholly and partially, and the area of private exploitation has been lessened. Parallel with this progressive nationalization or municipalization of industry, there has gone on, outside, the elimination of the purely personal element in business management. The older economists doubted whether anything but banking and insurance could be carried on by joint stock enterprise; now every conceivable industry down to baking and milk-selling is successfully managed by the salaried officers of large corporations of idle shareholders. More than one-third of the whole industry of England, measured by the capital employed, is now done by joint stock companies,[1] whose shareholders could be expropriated by the community with little more dislocation of industry than is caused by the daily purchase of shares on the Stock Exchange.

Besides all its direct supersession of private enterprise, the State now registers, inspects and controls nearly all the industrial functions

[1] See Mr. Giffen's statistics, brought up to date in *Capital and Land* (Fabian Tract No. 7).

which it has not yet absorbed. In addition to births, marriages, deaths, and electors, the State registers all solicitors, barristers, notaries, brokers, newspaper proprieters, playing-card makers, brewers, bankers, seamen, captains, mates, doctors, cabmen, hawkers, pawn-brokers, tobacconists, distillers, plate dealers, game dealers, all insurance companies, friendly societies, endowed schools and charities, limited companies, lands, houses, deeds, bills of sale, compositions, ships, arms, dogs, cabs, omnibuses, books, plays, pamphlets, newspapers, raw cotton, trade marks, and patents; lodging houses, public houses, refreshment houses, theatres, music halls, places of worship, elementary schools, and dancing rooms.

Nor is the registration a mere form. Most of the foregoing are also inspected and criticised, as well as all railways, tramways, ships, mines, factories, canal boats, public conveyances, fisheries, slaughter houses, dairies, milk shops, bakeries, baby farms, gas meters, schools of anatomy, vivisection laboratories, explosive works, Scotch herrings and common lodging houses.

The inspection is often detailed and exhaus-

tive. The State in most of the larger industrial operations prescribes the age of the worker, the hours of work, the amount of air, light, cubic space, heat, lavatory accommodation, holidays, and meal times; where, when, and how wages shall be paid; how machinery, staircases, lift-holes, mines, and quarries are to be fenced and guarded; how and when the plant shall be cleaned, repaired, and worked. Even the kind of package in which some articles shall be sold is duly prescribed, so that the individual capitalist shall take no advantage of his position. On every side he is being registered, inspected, controlled, and eventually superseded by the community, and is compelled in the meantime to cede for public purposes an ever increasing share of his rent and interest.

It will be objected by many persons that this is not what they understand by Socialism. There are doubtless still some who might be compelled to admit that they imagined that Socialists wanted to bring about a sanguinary conflict in the streets, and then the next day to compel all delicately nurtured people to work at a fixed rate of wages, in the government factories. This, however, is merely part of the

obstinate survival of the "Utopian" conception of Socialism already referred to. Whether we so describe them or not, these features of modern English society are essentially "collectivist" in character, and are utterly contrary to the Individualist principles lately dominant in thought. Mr. Herbert Spencer quite properly regards the whole course of legislation during the present generation as subversive of that unrestrained individual liberty which forms his ideal of social order.[1] He also foretells its inevitable issue.

"The numerous Socialistic changes made by Act of Parliament, joined with numerous others presently to be made, will by and by be all merged in State Socialism—swallowed in the vast wave which they have little by little raised." "It is indeed certain," the political economists now agree, "that industrial society will not permanently remain without a systematic organisation. The mere conflict of private interests will never produce a well-ordered commonwealth of labour."[2]

[1] *Man versus the State* (London, 1884, Williams & Norgate.)
[2] Dr. J. K. Ingram in article on *Political Economy* in Encyclopædia Britannica, ninth edition, Vol. XIX., p. 382 (1886.)

Our unconscious acceptance of this progressive Socialism is a striking testimony to the change which has come over the country of Godwin and Malthus. The "practical man," oblivious or contemptuous of any theory of the Social Organism or general principles of social organisation, has been forced by the necessities of the time, into an ever deepening collectivist channel. Socialism, of course, he still rejects and despises. The Individualist Town Councillor will walk along the municipal pavement, lit by municipal gas and cleansed by municipal brooms with municipal water, and seeing by the municipal clock in the municipal market, that he is too early to meet his children coming from the municipal school hard by the county lunatic asylum and municipal hospital, will use the national telegraph system to tell them not to walk through the municipal park but to come by the municipal tramway, to meet him in the municipal reading room, by the municipal art gallery, museum and library, where he intends to consult some of the national publications in order to prepare his next speech in the municipal town-hall, in favour of the nationalization of canals and the increase of the

government control over the railway system. "Socialism, sir," he will say, "don't waste the time of a practical man by your fantastic absurdities. Self-help, sir, individual self-help, that's what's made our city what it is."

CHAPTER VIII.

SOCIALISM IN POLITICS.

It is probable that in no other country are statesmen so ready as in England to carry out political proposals pressed upon them from below. Political platforms tend to be constructed, not so much out of abstract statements of rights and principles, as out of lists of new laws to be passed by the successful party. The English Constitution is admittedly deemed in need of perpetual legislative tinkering, and every Englishman, not excluding the most conservative, has his own pet list of necessary reforms. In the United States the popular cry seems to be mainly for good administration; in England it is undoubtedly for new laws. "Measures, not men," is still the English voter's motto.

This striking difference, in itself not without significance, leads to important consequences when public feeling is pressing in any political direction. The gradual "socialising" of poli-

tics, out of which the parliamentary and municipal Socialism has sprung, is rendered possible by the fluidity of the English Constitution. "It may be fearlessly said that no social transformation would be too great to be commended and attempted if only it could be clearly shown to lead to the greater happiness of the community. No scheme of Bellers, or Babœuf, or Robert Owen could be resisted, if only their advocates could adduce scientific evidence of their practicability and good tendency. No laws, no customs, no rights of property are so sacred that they may not be made away with, if it can be clearly shown that they stand in the way of the greatest happiness. *Salus populi suprema lex.*"[1]

Statesmen have, as we have seen, not been backward in availing themselves of this philosophic permission to improve the condition of

[1] Jevons' *The State in Relation to Labour* (1882), ch. 1., p. 12. It is interesting to compare with this deliberate statement of the English economist the opinion of Professor W. G. Sumner (Yale), "It is not to be admitted for a moment that liberty is a means to social ends, and that it may be impaired for major considerations. . . . . It is not at all the function of the State to make men happy." (*What Social Classes owe to Each other*, pp. 34-5.)

society by national or municipal action. Nor do they meet with resistance from their trained staff of permanent officials. The Civil Service is generally "collectivist" in its influence, even where not democratic, but nearly every government office now contains a number of advanced Socialists. The universal adoption of "open competition" is rapidly making the whole service democratic in sympathy, instead of being a happy hunting ground for younger sons and aristocratic parasites. The present condition of English politics makes it apparent that the progress in the future will be even greater than in the past. The near approach to genuine "manhood suffrage" has already compelled both great parties to profess their intention of passing further remedial legislation, and whilst they still weakly repudiate Socialism, almost every proposal bears the Socialist stamp.[1]

The Conservative party, now in power through the alliance of the "Liberal Unionists," can admittedly only retain office on condition of passing measures acceptable to the urban Democracy. The old rural Tory element, with

[1] See "Socialism in English Politics," by William Clarke, M.A., *Political Science Quarterly*, December, 1888.

tendencies towards a protective tariff, and a feudal extension of the Poor Law, is becoming more and more subordinated to the so-called "Tory Democracy," whose members appeal to the city artisans by promising Socialistic legislation against their employers. The almost revolutionary extension of local self-government conceded by the Conservative Government in 1888, will undoubtedly be used for a further extension of "Municipal Socialism." The urban Conservatives feel compelled to promise additional remedies for the poverty of our great cities, and talk of state-assisted emigration, the exclusion of foreign labour and the possibility of compulsory state insurance of all wage-earners. All these, be it noted, however ill-considered, are essentially "collectivist" proposals, opposed to every principle of Individualism. Meanwhile the leaders in Parliament are forced to act, and every adverse bye election drives them to further popular reforms. Free Schools granted in Scotland cannot long be withheld in England. The "Sweating System" and the excessive hours of labour call loudly for legislation.

The "Allotments Act" of 1886 enabled local authorities to acquire land compulsorily in

order to let it to small cultivators, and marks the beginning of "land municipalization." Both parties are now committed to its extension. Extensions of the Factory Acts, Truck Acts, Sanitary Acts, and especially Artisans' Dwellings Acts, are only other instances of the Conservative tendency towards Socialism, prematurely predicted by their great leader fifty years ago.[1]

But the Conservative Party, essentially the party of wealth and privilege, is naturally less advanced than its rival. The Liberal Party has now definitely discarded the Individualist *Laissez Faire*, upon which, as a middle class organization, it was so largely founded, and, with every approach towards democracy, becomes more markedly Socialist in character. Ireland has already led so "conservative" a statesman as Mr. Gladstone to deal successive blows at "landlordism," from the effect of which all private property in land and rent now totters. The Liberal Party is fully committed to free schools, special taxation of urban land values and large schemes of "Housing the Poor."

The London Liberal and Radical Union,

[1] See Lord Beaconsfield's *Sybil, or The Two Nations.*

the official party organisation in the Metropolis, with Mr. John Morley, for president, expressly promoted in 1889 a measure to enable the London County Council to build unlimited artisans' dwellings, to be let at moderate rents, and to be paid for by a special tax, to be levied on London landlords only.[1] No more extreme "Socialist" proposal could possibly be made, short of complete communism itself.

This, however, is merely the proposal of the "official Liberal" party. The Radical wing, every day increasing in relative influence, demands measures much more general in their Socialistic tendency.

One of the most significant changes is the attitude of the London working men's clubs. These two hundred or more spontaneous democratic organisations of the metropolitan artisans, constitute the most important part of the fighting strength of London Liberalism, and directly control at least one-fifth of its votes. Statistics are only available for about

[1] See the series of bills introduced into the House of Commons by Professor Stuart, M.P., and other London Liberal members, forming what is known (in 1889) as the "London Programme."

half these institutions, but of that half, most are quite new. Fifteen years ago there were only twenty or thirty of them; between 1874 and 1884, 50 still surviving, were established, and in the 4 years, 1884-88, no fewer than 78 sprang into durable existence.[1] Ten years ago their prevailing tone was a somewhat harsh, secular Radicalism, seeking extreme reforms in political machinery, but leaving social problems entirely to individual effort and an exaggerated faith in trades unionism. Now these organizations are pulling the party in quite the other direction. Merely political reforms are becoming daily more subordinated to attempts to deal with social problems. The prevailing note of the clubs is now a progressive collectivism. The nationalisation of the land hardly meets with dissent, and free schools (secondary as well as primary), the special taxation of urban land values, a steeply graduated income tax, and the widest possible extension of municipal administration are unanimously demanded. London Radicalism is rapidly merging its harsh atheistic Individualism in a broad humanitarian Collectivism.

[1] Report of Club and Institute Union, 1889.

Socialist lecturers are in incessant demand, and the Liberal party managers have avowedly come to the conclusion that London needs a specially Socialist platform. The "Star," the chief organ in the press of this Socialist Radicalism, constantly presses for a complete programme of social reconstruction, and the "abolition of undeserved poverty." The late School Board and County Council elections in London, as well as the recent Parliamentary "bye elections," were "run" on this policy, with a success which makes it certain that the next Parliamentary election, though obscured by the Home Rule issue, will follow on much the same lines. The following "programme for London," extracted from the "Star," 8th of August, 1888, will serve not only as a graphic example of what English Radicalism has now come to mean, but also, significantly enough, as a concrete statement of all the proximate demands of the English Socialist Party.

REVISION OF TAXATION.

Object.—Complete shifting of burden from the workers, of whatever grade, to the recipients of rent and interest, with a view to the ultimate and gradual extinction of the latter class.

Means.—1. Abolition of all customs and excise duties, except those on spirits. 2. Increase of income tax, differentiating in favour of earned as against unearned incomes, and graduating cumulatively by a system of successive levels of abatement. 3. Equalisation and increase of death duties, and the use of the proceeds as capital, not income. 4. Shifting of local rates and house duty from occupier to owner, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. 5. Compulsory redemption of existing land tax, and re-imposition on all ground rents and increased values. 6. Abolition of fees on licences for employment. 7. Abolition of police court fees.

Extension of Factory Acts.

Object.—To raise, universally, the standard of comfort by obtaining the general recognition of a minimum wage, and a maximum working day.

Means.—1. Extension of the general provisions of the Factory and Workshops Acts (or the Mines Regulation Acts, as the case may be) to all employers of labour. 2. Compulsory registration of all employers of more than three (?) workers. 3. Largely increased number of Inspectors, and these to include women, and to be mainly chosen from the wage-earning class. 4. Immediate reduction of maximum hours to eight per day in all government and municipal employment, in all mines, and in all licensed monopolies, such as railways, tramways, gas-works, water-works, docks, harbours, etc., and in any trade in which a majority of the workers desire it. 5. The compulsory insertion of clauses in all contracts for government

or municipal supplies, providing that *(a)* there shall be no sub-contracting; *(b)* that no worker shall be employed more than eight hours per day, and *(c)* that no wages less than a prescribed minimum shall be paid.

Educational Reform.

Object—To enable all, even the poorest, children to obtain not merely some, but the best education they are capable of.

Means—1. The immediate abolition of all fees in public elementary schools, board or voluntary, with a corresponding increase in the goverment grant. 2. Creation of a Minister for Education, with control over the whole educational system, from the elementary school to the University, and over all educational endowments. 3. Provision of public technical and secondary schools wherever needed, and creation of abundant public secondary scholarships 4. Continuation, in all cases, of elementary education at evening schools. 5. Registration and inspection of all private educational establishments.

Reorganization of Poor Law Administration.

Object.—To provide generously and without stigma for the aged, the sick, and those destitute through temporary want of employment, without relaxing the "tests" against the endowment of able-bodied idleness.

Means.—1. The separation of the relief of the aged and the sick, from the workhouse system, by a universal system of aged pensions and public infirmaries. 2. The industrial

organization and technical education of all able-bodied paupers. 3. The provision of temporary relief works for the unemployed. 4. The supersession of the Boards of Guardians by the local municipal authorities.

Extension of Municipal Activity.

Object.—The gradual public organization of labour for all public purposes, and the elimination of the private capitalist and middleman.

Means.—1. The provision of increased facilities for the acquisition of land, the destruction without compensation of all dwellings found unfit for habitation, and the provision of artisans' dwellings by the municipality. 2. The facilitation of every extension of municipal administration, in London and all other towns, of gas, water, markets, tramways, hospitals, cemeteries, parks, museums, art galleries, libraries, reading-rooms, schools, docks, harbours, rivers, etc. 3. The provision of abundant facilities for the acquisition of land by local rural authorities, for allotments, common pastures, public halls, reading-rooms, etc.

Amendment of Political Machinery.

Object.—To obtain the most accurate representation and expression of the desires of the majority of the people at every moment.

Means.—1. Reform of registration so as to give a vote, both parliamentary and municipal, to every adult. 2.

Abolition of of any period of residence as a qualification for registration. 3. Bi-annual registration by special public officer. 4. Payment of election expenses, including postage of election addresses and polling cards. 5. Payment of all public representatives, parliamentary, county or municipal. 6. Second ballot. 7. Abolition or painless extinction of House of Lords.

This is the kind of programme to which a generation of trades unionism and political enfranchisement has brought the English artisan since the crude political reforms advocated by the Chartists. Like John Stuart Mill, though less explicitly, he has abandoned mere political Democracy for an almost complete Socialism.

It need hardly be said that no such programme of legislation can be carried out in a single session. It is probable, indeed, that for much of it the rest of England is not yet sufficiently prepared. The tendency is, however, strong in that direction, and the "political momentum which, instead of diminishing or remaining constant, increases,"[1] will inevitably carry us rapidly forward.

The greatest obstacle in the way of more

[1] Herbert Spencer, *Man versus the State*, p. 23.

speedy realization of the public desires is now the divergence in thought between the leaders of the Liberal Party and the great mass of the wage earners. The Liberal Party is rapidly becoming the "Party of the Masses," as Mr. Gladstone predicted in 1885, but its leaders and its chief provincial supporters are still either Whigs, or Radicals not yet free from the taint of the "Manchester" school. It is already becoming apparent that the "Party of Progress" must either become the "Labour Party," or be superseded by the latter, and there can be little doubt that the first of these alternatives will be chosen. As this will imply the further secession of most of the remaining capitalists and middle class, decisive action will be postponed as long as possible. The long traditional political subservience of the wage-earners, not to mention their disorganization and their divisions, will probably enable the Liberal wire-pullers, as between 1880 and 1885, greatly to delay any organic social reforms. The complications arising out of the Irish Question, possible foreign entanglements or amendments of political machinery, may all serve as temporary defences of rent and interest. If these fail, the Disestablishment of the Church,

or the Abolition of Hereditary Legislators, may easily divert the attack for half a generation.

The mass of the people cannot, however, be wholly denied their desires, and various fiscal and social reforms—all in one direction—will inevitably be getting carried out. Meanwhile, the local administrative bodies will necessarily be passing more and more out of the hands of the middle class into real democratic control. It is mainly for "Municipal Socialism" that the near future is bright, but the potentialities of this as a means of the elevation of the poor are as yet hardly suspected.

National action cannot, however, be entirely suspended, and it is possible that the wage-earners may refuse to be cajoled by the leaders of either of the obsolescent parties, and will insist on a genuine attempt being made to deal with social problems.

The steady growth of "social compunction" among all classes will promote the same result. Just now (Dec. 1889) the tendency is strong in this direction, and it may perhaps carry us forward more rapidly than any politician yet foresees. The individual appropriation of rent and interest

is becoming more and more discredited among the mass of the population who are practically unable to share in this income; and they are quickly coming to demand that social arrangements shall be deliberately based on what are essentially Socialist principles. The Christian is every day inclining to the feeling that his faith requires him to support the same demand; the Political Economist has ceased to resist, counselling merely circumspection and moderation; the Practical Reformer is driven by the impossibility of otherwise adequately dealing with social evils into the same direction, and the Statesman sees more and more clearly that this is the outcome of urban Democracy in advanced industrial communities, with their excessive development of city life. The industrial evolution, as usual, precedes and accompanies the political, and all social tendencies point to the same end. What the exact form and machinery may be, it is, of course, impossible to predict, nor how long each stage may last, but no student of English thought and politics can doubt that England is destined to become constantly more and more "collectivist" as it advances in industrial complexity, in realized wealth, and in political de-

niocracy. The Individualism of the past is buried, and the immediate future is unmistakably with a progressive Socialism, the full extent of which no man can yet see.

THE END.

Cowan & Co., Limited, Printers, Perth.

INDEX.

Anarchism, 55
Aveling, E. B. and E. M., 88
Aveling, Rev. F. W., 84
Associations of Producers, xix., 89, 91

Babœuf, 4, 119
Barnett, Rev. S. A., 70
Bax, E. Belfort, 36
Besant, Annie, 32, 38
Bishops, The, on Socialism, 65
Bloomsbury Socialist Society, 41
Booth, Charles, 108
Bosanquet, Bernard, 77
Burns, John, xvi., 30, 41, 47
Burrows, Herbert, 22

Cabet, 4
Cairnes, J. E., 89
Campanella, 4
Campbell, W. H. P., 40
Carlyle, T., 20
Carpenter, Edward, 42
Carpenter's Political Magazine, 23
Catastrophic Changes Abandoned, 8
Champion, H. H., 47
Chartism, 19
Christian Socialist, 39
Christian Socialists, xix, 20, 39
Christian Socialist Society, 39, 63
Christian Social Union, xv., 64
Church Reformer, 64
Clarke, William, 18, 38
Clifton and Bristol Socialist Society, 42
Clubs in London, 123
Collectivism, Definition of, 9, 10
Commonweal, xiii., 35
Communities, Socialist, 6
Comte, Auguste, 4
Conservative Party, The, 3, 120
Continuity of Social Progress, 5
Co-operation, xviii., 89
Co-operative Production, xix, 89 91
Courtney, L. H., 91
Cowen, Joseph, 22

Darwin, Charles, 4
Davitt, Michael, 61
Democratic Federation, 22
Dock Strike, 52
Dove, Patrick Edward, 23
Dynamic Ideals, 5

Eight Hours Bill, 104
English Land Restoration League, xv., 57
Evolutionary Socialism, 5

Fabian Essays, 18, 38, 76
Fabian News, xiv.
Fabian Society, xii., xiv., 12, 36, 75
Facts for Londoners, xvi.
Factory Legislation, 15, 19, 98
Financial Reform Association, 59
Fourier, 4
Foxwell, Prof. H. S., 87
Freedom, 56
French Socialism, 8

Gasworks, Municipal, 102
Gasworkers, 52
George, Henry, 21, 57, 59
German Socialism, 8
Glasgow, Municipal Action at, 108
Glasse, Rev. John, 61, 70
Gore, H. H., 42
Grahame, Cunningham, 47
Guild of St. Matthew, 40, 64, 73

Hammersmith Socialist Society, xiii.
Harcourt, Sir William, 1
Hardie, J. Keir, 47
Headlam, Rev. S. D., 64
Health Acts, 101
Herbert, Hon. Auberon, 80
Holland, Canon Scott, 64, 70
Holyoake, G. J., 6, 93
Hughes, Rev. Hugh Price, 69
Housing of the Poor, 108
Hyndman, H. M., 5, 22, 31

Independent Labour Party, xxi.
Individualism, 79
Individualist Radicalism, 26
Ingram, Dr. J. K., 88, 115
International Congress, 35, 49
Ireland, Movement in, 61

Jevons, W. Stanley, 79, 104, 119
Joynes, J. L., 32
Justice, xiv., 31

Kirkup, T., 10
Knights of Labour, 44
Kropotkine, Prince, 33, 56

Labour Elector, 48
Labour Electoral Association, 44
Labour Party, xiii., xxi., 44
Land and Labour, 87
Land and Labour League, 23
Land Movement, 60
Land Nationalisation Society, 57
Lassalle, Ferdinand, 5, 19
Leslie, T. E. Cliffe, 90
Liberals and Socialism, xvii., 122
Liberty and Property Defence League, 80
London County Council, xvi., 30, 49
London Programme, xvii., 123
Looking Backward, 88

Mann, Tom, 47
Marx, Karl, 19, 31, 85, 88
Matchgirls Strike, 51
Mavor, Professor, 61
Mill, J. S., 19, 83, 85, 89
Mills, Rev. H. V., 107
More, Sir Thomas, 4
Morris, William, xiii., 33, 109
Mundella, A. J., 99
Municipalisation of Land, 24, 109
Municipal Socialism, 102, 109, 116, 131

Nationalisation of the Land, 23, 80, 109
Nihilism, 8

Ogilvie, Professor, 23
O'Brien, Bronterre, 23
Olivier, Sydney, 38
Owen, Robert,

Pan Anglican Conference, 65
Paris Municipal Council, 8
Peach, Rev. C., 42
Pearse, Rev. Mark Guy, 69
Pearson, Prof. Karl, 77
Permeation, 8, 25
Plato's Republic, 4
Plener, E. von, 99
Politics, Change in English, 2
Positivism, 20
Potter, Beatrice, xix.
Programme, Practical, 125
Progress and Poverty, 21

Radicalism, Change in Character of, [26;
" Failure of, 20
Red Van Campaigns, xv.
Rent of Ability, 95
Rent, Law of, 21
Ricardo, David, 21
Ritchie, D. G., 77
Roman Catholics, Socialism among, 71

Ruskin, John, 20
Russian Nihilism, 8

Saint Simon, 4
Scotland, Socialism in, 60
Scottish Land and Labour League, 61
Scottish Socialist Federation, 61
Shaw, G. Bernard, xiv., 38
Sheffield Socialists, 42
Sedgwick, Prof. H., 83, 84
Smith, Adolphe, 35
Social Democratic Federation, xiii., 14, 23, 30
Socialism, Definition of, 9, 12
,, Imperfections of, 11
,, Rise of, 18
,, Direction of Progress of, 15
Socialist League, xiii., 33
Spence, Thomas, 23
Spencer, Herbert, 4, 80, 87
Spicer, Albert, 73
Star, 125
Statical Utopias, 4
Symes, Rev. J. E., 57

Taylor, Helen, 22
Taylor, Jonathan, 43
Taxation of Ground Rents, 58
Threlfall, T. R., 47
Tillett, Ben, 53
Toynbee, Arnold, 75
Toynbee Hall Settlement, 75
Trade Unionism, xviii., xxi., 35
Tramways, 102

Unemployed, The, 107
Universities, Influence of the, 78
Utopian Socialism, 3

Wales, Prince of, 1
Water-works, 102
Wallace, Alfred Russell, 57
Wallas, Graham, 38
Wells, Dean of, 70
Wesleyans, Socialism among, 69
Westcott, Rev. Canon, 70
What to Read, xii.
Wicksteed, Rev. P. H., 70
Wilson, Charlotte, 56

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 July, 2018